

RELIGION
AND
RECONCILIATION
IN GREEK CITIES

*The Sacred Laws
of Selinus and Cyrene*

NOEL ROBERTSON



VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

RELIGION
AND
RECONCILIATION
IN GREEK CITIES

*The Sacred Laws
of Selinus and Cyrene*

NOEL ROBERTSON



Religion and Reconciliation in Greek Cities

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

AMERICAN CLASSICAL STUDIES

VOLUME 54

Series Editor

Kathryn J. Gutzwiller

Studies in Classical History and Society

Meyer Reinhold

Sextus Empiricus

The Transmission and Recovery of Pyrrhonism

Luciano Floridi

The Augustan Succession

An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books

55–56 (9 B. C.–A.D. 14)

Peter Michael Swan

Greek Mythography in the Roman World

Alan Cameron

Virgil Recomposed

The Mythological and Secular Centos in Antiquity

Scott McGill

Representing Agrippina

Constructions of Female Power in the Early Roman Empire

Judith Ginsburg

Figuring Genre in Roman Satire

Catherine Keane

Homer's Cosmic Fabrication

Choice and Design in the Iliad

Bruce Heiden

Hyperides

Funeral Oration

Judson Herrman

Religion and Reconciliation in Greek Cities

The Sacred Laws of Selinus and Cyrene

Noel Robertson

Religion and Reconciliation in Greek Cities

The Sacred Laws of Selinus and Cyrene

NOEL ROBERTSON

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

2010



Oxford University Press, Inc., publishes works that further Oxford University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship, and education.

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi

Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi

New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece

Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore

South Korea Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Copyright © 2010 by the American Philological Association

Published by Oxford University Press, Inc.

198 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016

www.oup.com

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of Oxford University Press.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Robertson, Noel.

Religion and reconciliation in Greek cities : the sacred laws of Selinus and Cyrene / Noel Robertson.

p. cm.—(American Philological Association American classical studies ; v. 54)

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 978-0-19-539400-9

1. Selinus (Extinct city)—Religious life and customs. 2. Rites and ceremonies—Italy—Selinus (Extinct city) 3. Religious law and legislation—Italy—Selinus (Extinct city) 4. Religious calendars—Italy—Selinus (Extinct city) 5. Inscriptions, Greek—Italy—Selinus (Extinct city) 6. Cyrene (Extinct city)—Religious life and customs. 7. Rites and ceremonies—Libya—Cyrene (Extinct city) 8. Religious law and legislation—Libya—Cyrene (Extinct city) 9. Religious calendars—Libya—Cyrene (Extinct city) 10. Inscriptions, Greek—Libya—Cyrene (Extinct city) 11. Religious calendars—Greek religion. I. Title.

BL793.S46R63 2009

292.08—dc22 2009002662

For

E. L. R.

E. A. R.

S. A. R.

L. I. R.

Preface

This book is an interpretation of two unusual documents of Greek religion, which though of obvious importance have baffled understanding until now. Both are “sacred laws” calling for certain rites to be performed; they would normally be of interest to specialists alone. But in both, the variety of items and the strangeness of some are unparalleled. It is because old customs have been selected, and new occasions have been devised, so as to satisfy and reconcile the unequal members of a traditional society, the few and the many who are so often set against each other. Both documents are tantamount to a religious reform, otherwise hardly seen in Greek cities.

There have been three successive versions, differing considerably in the material included. The original version was much improved by expert criticism. Robert Parker at a busy time probed and queried much of it. An authoritative reader for the APA Monograph Committee supplied a searching philological critique. Kathryn Gutzwiller, chair of the committee, tactfully and patiently guided both revisions. After this long process, the book is dedicated to four family members in gratitude for their unfailing interest and forbearance.

Contents

Abbreviations

Introduction

Part I. At Selinus, Rules throughout the Year

1. The Lead Tablet
2. Displaying the Tablet
3. A Household Offering
4. The *Kotytia* and the Olympic Truce
5. The Solstice Festival at Olympia
6. Zeus *Eumenes* and the *Eumenides*
7. The *Semnai Theai*
8. Zeus *Milichios* in Spring
9. Before the Harvest
10. *Tritopatreis* Foul and Pure
11. *Tritopatreis* as Wind Gods
12. Zeus *Milichios* in Summer
13. After the Harvest
14. Hospitality for an *Elasteros*
15. Zeus *Elasteros* and Other Lightning Gods
16. Selinus, c. 450 b.c.

Part II. At Cyrene, Rules for Every Need

17. The Inscription
18. Some General Rules
19. *Akamantes* and *Tritopateres*
20. The Tithing Rules
21. Rites of Artemis
22. Suppliant Purifications

23. Cyrene, c. 335-324 b.c.

References

Subject Index

Select Index of Sources

Abbreviations

Ancient authors and works, as well as epigraphic and papyrological publications, are abbreviated as in Liddell, Scott, and Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. (Oxford 1940), xvi-xlvi, together with *Revised Supplement* (1996), x-xxxi, or more fully. Periodicals and reference works are abbreviated as in the *American Journal of Archaeology* 111 (2007): 14-34, or more fully. In citing standard editions of Greek or Latin authors by the editor's name I add the place and date of publication if this seems helpful. The following items are additional:

Bernabé, <i>Orph.</i>	A. Bernabé, <i>Orphicorum et Orphicis similium testimonia et fragmenta</i> , 2 vols., Munich 2004–2005.
Chantraine, <i>DELG, Suppl.</i>	P. Chantraine, <i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque</i> , Paris 1968, <i>Supplement</i> 1999.
Frisk, <i>GEW</i>	H. Frisk, <i>Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch</i> , Heidelberg 1960–1979.
<i>IGDS</i>	L. Dubois, <i>Inscriptions grecques dialectales de Sicile</i> , Paris 1989.
Kannicht	R. Kannicht, <i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , vol. 5 (Euripides), Göttingen 2004.
<i>LGPN</i>	P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews, <i>Lexicon of Greek Personal Names</i> , 5 vols., Oxford 1987–2005.
Massimilla	G. Massimilla, <i>Callimacho, Aitia I-II</i> , Pisa 1996.
Schwyzler, <i>Gr. Gram.</i>	E. Schwyzler and A. Debrunner, <i>Griechische Grammatik</i> , 4 vols., Berlin 1953–1994. Threatte,
<i>Gram. Attic Inscr.</i>	L. Threatte, <i>The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions</i> , 2 vols., Berlin 1980–1996.

Religion and Reconciliation in Greek Cities

Introduction

Sacred Laws

Greek inscriptions regulating sacred matters, sacred laws so called, are a large and varied class; they help us to a more realistic understanding of Greek religion than we obtain from literary works or monuments. They are seldom laws in the sense of enactments by an official body but rather customs of self-evident authority. They plunge us straightway into details of priests and processioners and cult associates, of groves and altars and offerings, of treasuries and inventories, and of ritual of every kind from personal ablutions to interstate festivals, but especially of animal sacrifice, a way of life as much as a religious ceremony. They have come to light all round the Greek world, in the homeland and in colonial areas, and from an early period, as early as any kind of public inscription. Similar details recur everywhere. In the light of sacred laws we could assert the proposition, if Herodotus had not already done so, that next to consanguinity and language Greeks are defined by their religion.

A sacred law gives notice, whether to neighbors of a local sanctuary or far and wide. The most comprehensive are sacred “calendars” published by a city or a village or other social entity. These are long lists of sacrifices, sometimes of other things as well, month by month, even day by day, throughout the year. They are valuable not only for their assortment of detail, but for showing what is most essential to our understanding, the seasonal context of each item. Greek religion is a nature religion suited to the resources and the livelihoods of the Mediterranean shores that the Greeks inhabited. The yearly progress of the seasons calls for a cycle of ritual addressed to deities who inhabit different parts of nature.

Sacred laws may be prompted by changing conditions or by large events. The most elaborate example of a sacred calendar was assembled and published at Athens at almost the worst time in the city’s history, the last years of the Peloponnesian War and the ensuing years of internal conflict. Other calendars were compiled to mark a synoecism, the enlargement of a community, as when the island of Cos became prosperous and much visited. Festivals were extended or even created to show off the importance of a growing city. Cult associations were formed to satisfy needs newly felt, such as loyalty or good

fellowship or a deeper piety. The Eleusinian Mysteries, a universal cult of the grain goddess transcending city-state and every other allegiance, issued schedules and regulations repeatedly during more than seven centuries.

Such are sacred laws, their scope and character. But the two inscriptions that are the subject of this book are different from all the rest: a sacred law of Selinus of the mid-fifth century, and another of Cyrene of the late fourth century. Both are extraordinary documents of Greek religion that have resisted any satisfactory interpretation.

The Sacred Law of Selinus

The inscription of Selinus in southwest Sicily was first published in 1993. It is a large lead tablet about two feet wide and eight inches high, dated by letter forms to the mid-fifth century B.C. It sets out rules for sacrifice and other ritual in two columns of writing that are upside down to each other. This format is unique and unexplained. A bronze bar is laid vertically between the columns so as to clamp the tablet with just three nails to some wooden fixture; at any given time the column that is right side up is on the right. The tablet had been exhibited for a considerable time, to judge from signs of wear. But as soon as the display ended, it disappeared from sight, to be rediscovered only at the present day. Otherwise the lead would have been reused, as always.

The two columns are of quite unequal length and substance. Column A fills up half the tablet, from top to bottom. After a preliminary offering and a heading, sacrifices are prescribed to Zeus *eumenês* and the *Eumenides*, to Zeus *milichios* at a place strangely named, to *Tritopatreis* both foul and pure, and again to Zeus *milichios* at another place strangely named. For all but Zeus *eumenês* and the *Eumenides*, the mode of sacrifice and other ritual actions are set forth in great detail. The heading gives the deadline for performing the whole series of sacrifices. The preliminary offering is but partly legible; there are traces of an earlier and lengthier version that was erased. Column B is only half as long as column A and was even shorter at first, being extended as an afterthought. All the ritual of column B is addressed to a power called *elasteros*; the person performing the ritual is described as *autorektas*; both terms are enigmatic. The ritual, including sacrifice, is meant to purify the person from the power.

When the tablet came to the Getty Museum in Malibu (to be returned in due course to Italy), it was studied and published by three leading scholars in the fields of Greek religion and epigraphy, M. H. Jameson, D. R. Jordan and R. H. Kotansky. Their monograph *A lex*

sacra from *Selinous* is a model of promptness and thoroughness. They do not disguise the difficulties, but offer nonetheless a consistent general picture. It is based on the somber nature of the deities in column A and on the motif of purification in column B and on many details in both columns that might evoke homicide and kinship and the fear of vengeance or retribution. In summary, it is as follows.

In column A, the *Eumenides*, Zeus *milichios*, and *Tritopatreis* are all concerned with bloodshed. The *Eumenides* pursue offenders and threaten each household and the community at large; Zeus *milichios* is concerned with the purification of both individuals and the community; *Tritopatreis* as primordial ancestors are alarmed and angry but turn from “foul” to “pure” when the guilt is removed. Both certain kinship groups and the whole community seem to be at risk. The heading announces a deadline by which the community must be purified, but the sacrifices are all performed by kinship groups. The preliminary offering is avowedly made by a household; the two cults of Zeus *milichios* are in the hands of named kinship groups, prominent persons as it seems; cults of *Tritopatreis* must belong to kinship groups at Selinus as elsewhere. It may be either that the whole community is represented by a few leading families, or that these are chiefly implicated in the bloodshed.

In column B, the purifying ritual is intended for a homicide, the supposed meaning of *autorektas*, and for other guilty persons. The *elasteros* from whom one is purified is cognate with *alastôr*; it is an avenging spirit or, less probably, a vengeful ghost. The ritual consists of a display of hospitality, a concrete magical display. A similar display is prescribed in a certain section of the sacred law of Cyrene. Here it is sometimes thought to be addressed to a power called *hikesios*, supposed to mean “visitant,” and thus comparable to the *elasteros*.

The tablet is assigned to the aftermath of what must have been a sanguinary episode of civil strife: these are various remedies to restore the peace. They may be for individuals or for families, and they may be single or repeated; a continuing need is envisaged. But it is not explained how the tablet, with its remarkable format, was consulted.

Jameson, Jordan, and Kotansky acknowledge the difficulty of the inscription and the uncertainty of their interpretation at many points and overall; indeed they insist upon the difficulty and the uncertainty. They undoubtedly expected a searching discussion to ensue. Yet the interpretation has mostly been accepted entire, or varied only by choosing between alternatives they left open. A few alternatives suggested since have brought no improvement and have gained no further acceptance. In fact the whole approach is dubious. The sacrifices of column A and the other ritual of column B are thought of

as a means of purging blood guilt, but the only analogy is that section of the sacred law of Cyrene, and it too is perplexing. The meaning of *hikesios* is as obscure as the meaning of *elasteros*; it has been debated much longer—for the past eighty years. The sacred law of Cyrene in any case covers a wide variety of things that are remote from the business of Selinus' tablet.

To put it briefly, the word *elasteros* cannot have the meaning or the etymology assigned to it. The purifying ritual is conformable with a deity of the usual kind, a power of nature. The meaning of *autorektas*, "slaying with one's own hand," is as apt for a sacrificial procedure as for a homicide; the equivalent term *autophonos* happens to be used in another section of the sacred law of Cyrene in which a person newly purified, but not from homicide, demonstrates his worthiness by a careful sacrifice. If column B has nothing to do with homicide, column A has nothing to do with either homicide or kinship groups. The two cults of Zeus *milichios* belong to outlying parts of the city known for rites of spring and of harvest time respectively. The stories associating Zeus *milichios* and the *Eumenides* with homicide are stories only, with the heightened colors of fiction; they are not the daily outlook of cult, where the purifying ritual is addressed to powers of nature. As for *Tritopatreis*, it is mere scholastic dogma that makes them into general or typical ancestors; it is belied by a century of archaeological discovery that shows only powers of nature.

In contrast to the obscure *elasteros*, the deities of column A are all known from a wide range of evidence, literary and archaeological and epigraphic. The *editio princeps* indicates this evidence almost without omission, but shows at the same time that it has not been properly scrutinized even as it has been growing. The evidence of archaeology and inscriptions throws new light on that of literature, exposing the real purpose behind the literary one. It also supplies detail that was never taken up in literature.

The several deities of column A are worshipped at certain moments in the spring and early summer, a critical period when a community renews its resources and hangs on each natural process or event. But they are far from being the only deities, or even the most prominent, who are worshipped at this time of year; they are selected for a certain purpose. The one deity of column B represents the other half of the year. Deliberately anonymous, he stands for a recurring natural event that was much feared. In both columns, the deities are chosen, and the ritual is prescribed, because they and it will appeal to everyone, rich and poor alike. In both columns, a leading feature of the ritual is the many alternatives, more and less costly, which have been devised with great ingenuity.

We have then a sacrificial code associating rich and poor. Selinus

was a very rich city, renowned as such at the very time of this curious lead tablet. The great temples and other evidence of its wealth are also evidence of stability, to which the tablet perhaps contributed. It is ironic that when Selinus was suddenly destroyed by the Carthaginians in 409 B.C., the tablet was at the same time preserved.

The Sacred Law of Cyrene

The much longer inscription of Cyrene in north Africa came to light in 1922, as Italian excavations began, and was soon published, indeed twice published, from the stone; it has recently been published once more from squeezes. It occupies two faces of a tall marble block that also bears the proud record of Cyrene's grain exports at a time of famine in the Greek homeland, c. 330–325 B.C.; the two inscriptions are in similar lettering of this period. The block originally stood in the great sanctuary of Apollo in the northwest sector of the city. The content is divided by short horizontal lines, *paragraphoi*, into some twenty sections (a few depend on restoration) that present an appearance of greater uniformity than emerges from a careful reading. There are twelve undoubted sections on the first face, preserved to its full extent, though much broken at the last. There are seven sections on the second face up to the point where it breaks off entirely.

This inscription too is very difficult. Even now, after many years, there is no agreed opinion on the most important matters or on the general purpose. Perhaps no other Greek inscription that is so extensive and so well preserved has remained so enigmatic for so long.

The first face, column A, has a heading in larger letters: Apollo ordered the people of Cyrene to abide by certain forms of ritual. The rule that immediately follows is of a fitting dignity, a public sacrifice to Apollo outside the city gates. Yet an element of superstitious magic is included, a red-haired victim. The next few rules are both trivial and oddly assorted: how to obtain wood for any purpose and what washing or other care is needed after impure occasions like sexual intercourse and childbirth. Then comes a new dispensation that is somehow important, since it mostly concedes, but also restricts, access to certain holy places. Now this rule has been found almost impenetrable. "Everyone" is concerned, and is either "pure" or "profane." Remarkably, the names that somehow identify the places include *Tritopateres*, an equivalent form of Selinus' *Tritopatreis*, and Battus, the founder of Cyrene. Conformably with the misunderstanding of *Tritopatreis* already mentioned, it is thought that the holy places may be tombs. The next rule seems trivial once more: how to scrape and scrub an altar when a wrong victim has been sacrificed. Thus far we have a strange variety of short staccato items.

There follows a single line marked off by itself, which is sometimes ascribed to the previous rule, sometimes to the following set of five rules. These are perfectly symmetrical at ten lines each (but one is also subdivided) and fittingly describe a “tithing” obligation to Apollo that falls on certain persons and properties making up the fivefold division. The obligation in each case is to purify Apollo’s sanctuary and oneself and one’s property and also, as a much greater burden, to sacrifice animals valued at a literal tithe. The five sections insist very sharply on the proper times or circumstances for discharging the obligation. The tithing rules with their precise and repetitive language are both the longest and the weightiest part of the inscription. They are seldom noticed nowadays, much less studied.

The second face, column B, begins with three related sections expressed in language that has some similarity to the tithing rules. But these are rules for young women, requiring them to attend at stated times at the shrine of Artemis. There follows a rule about the impurity caused by miscarriage, not unlike the rules about sexual intercourse and childbirth. Next come three sections neatly associated by a common heading and by three individual subheadings. The meaning of every word in these headings, especially the word *hikesios*, is obscure and controverted. Furthermore, despite the headings, there is no such similarity among the three sections as there is among the tithing rules or the rules for young women. All three are sometimes thought to be about propitiating uncanny powers, “visitants,” much like those of Selinus as the lead tablet has been interpreted. But sometimes they are thought to be about receiving and purifying “suppliants.” On a different view, only the first rule is referred to a visitant, and the second and third are referred to suppliants. Yet the language of each section, both vocabulary and syntax, is peculiar to itself. So is the substance of each section, whatever view is taken of visitants or suppliants. The substance ranges from trivial to weighty, from making and manipulating figurines to a public ceremony before a body of witnesses. The third section is nearly complete when the surface of the stone gives way.

The inscription was of great importance at Cyrene, as shown by its size and the manner of display in Apollo’s sanctuary. As soon as it was published, the foremost scholars of the day vied in expounding the many strangely varied rules. They did not succeed very well, as the foregoing summary will suffice to show. It has subsequently entered the standard collections of sacred laws and of dialectal and historical documents. But it is rarely discussed as a whole, and then only to remark the problems. And rules so strangely brought together have not often been mentioned separately. Indeed, the two longest parts, the tithing rules and the devotions of young women, are almost

wholly neglected. It is not that the cults of Apollo and of Artemis are neglected; rather the opposite, but this evidence is problematic and therefore recalcitrant to the global theorizing now applied to Greek religion. The only part that is commonly and confidently cited is the last, the three rules about ostensible “visitants” or “suppliants.” They are bracketed with column B of the Selinus tablet.

At the time of publication sacred laws were not known so well as they are today, and the language and monuments of Cyrene were just beginning to be known. It is possible now to direct a brighter light on the inscription and to reveal features unrecognized before. The sacred law of Selinus especially demands comparison, but without the fixed idea of visitants or suppliants. Both of these documents are remarkably diverse, Cyrene’s even more so. With the latter, the very language keeps changing because it refers sometimes to old customs and sometimes to new arrangements. Old customs can be briefly evoked, but new arrangements must be indicated carefully. High ceremony goes with vulgar magic, as at Selinus but more often. Though Cyrene was a conservative Dorian city devoted to ceremony, magic was also in the air. Both rich and poor are solicited by different means, and also those between. Another element can be discerned. At Cyrene Libyans had a greater share in the benefits of city life than natives living next to other Greek colonies; a certain part of the rules seems to be for them. The whole series of rules is an artful combination. It does not follow any natural order, as in the calendar or on the ground, but suits a variety of needs by an acceptable progression.

Returning to the several parts distinguished above, we see first a few items that every citizen will welcome or at least accept. Public sacrifice at the city gates is as always, but with a magic urgency. Wood from Apollo’s sacred land is now provided to everyone, not only to the privileged. The universal requirements of physical purity are explained, but as a bare minimum that will not be irksome. After such mild uncontroversial rules comes a striking innovation. Shrines of *Akamantes* and *Tritopateres* are thrown open to general use, with a remedy in case of error that happens to recall the ritual of *Tritopatreis* at Selinus. These wind gods of Attic origin are especially esteemed in the genial climate of Cyrene, and many will now enjoy their aid without the intervention of priestly families.

The tithing rules as the centerpiece of the inscription impose a heavy burden on a lesser class of citizen. This might well have formed the subject of a separate law or decree. Sacrifices of the value of a tithe produce a quantity of meat that will be widely distributed. It is a popular measure at the cost of a few, like the opening of those shrines, but on a far larger scale. It is strict, but also just; hence the careful

repetitious language. At the last, in the third generation, a member of the tithed class is released from his obligation. The class are probably the offspring of Greek fathers and Libyan mothers. And the other long rules that follow, the rites of Artemis in similar language, are for the women of this class. Nowhere else is such curious old ritual straightforwardly described. It comes as a revelation that transforms our understanding of the goddess Artemis.

The last part, like the first, is a mixture of things; both parts have been devised as a framing device for the tithing rules and the rites of Artemis. The common heading and the three subheadings echo the opening words of the inscription, about forms of ritual ordained by Apollo. The three rules are three forms of "suppliant purification." In the first form a house is purified by exorcising ghosts who have been conjured against it. They receive a formal invitation to a full-course meal, at which they are represented by figurines. We are reminded of the entertainment of an *elasteros* at Selinus, but this is a lesser occasion and a cruder pretense. In the second form an anxious person, anxious for any reason as it seems, consults the local oracle of Apollo and is assessed for a small offering. In the third form a person of substance presents himself to an intercessor as a declared suppliant and undergoes an official purification before certain witnesses representing the whole community. The procedure is familiar from literature and also agrees with a decree of Lindus recently published.

The inscription breaks off just before the end of this third form. We cannot tell whether there was more; it would not be much in any case. The overall arrangement is clear. As at Selinus the authorities have endeavored to satisfy both rich and poor and also those between. Some rules will satisfy all; others are alternatives; yet others are leveling. The longest parts, the tithing rules and the rites of Artemis, concern another element in the city, most likely those of mixed blood, Greek and Libyan. They have the double effect of assimilating the newcomers, albeit at a certain price, and of pleasing everyone else.

Religion and the City

Greek religion as we know it, the cults and myths of Olympian and lesser deities, is coeval with the Greek city. Despite a general opinion, the emergence of the city cannot be put as late as the end of the Geometric period. In the early Dark Age, when people sailed from Attica and the northern Peloponnesus to find a safer home in the Aegean islands or on the coast of Anatolia, the new settlements were already cities, inasmuch as they were closely organized by means of monthly calendars, whether Ionian or Dorian, which the emigrants created for just this purpose. Each month is named for a festival.

Every city then and later had its own sequence of month names, but in any given area the calendars were as much alike as the settlers were related. Now the Ionian and to a less extent the Dorian domain where people gathered and dispersed in the early Dark Age is also the part of the Greek world where we find, after some centuries, most of the sacred calendars that are published on stone. Though the long list of occasions in a sacred calendar, reunions both large and small, could not be exhibited until the use of writing became common, they were important from the moment a city was founded. Herodotus' dictum is doubly true. Greeks were defined by their religion as soon as they appeared on the ground.

Greek religion must also be seen in a larger context. The gods were there on the land, controlling the weather and producing the crops, long before the cities emerged. Like the gods of any nature religion, and most like those of the ancient Near East, they had taken human shape as objects of the timeless magic operations of ritual. But they lent themselves to the organization of cities when this new mode of life first grew up outside the Bronze-Age heartland in the Near East. Greek poetry arose in the same period, its earliest creations subsumed under Homer's name. It circulated among the cities and imposed a universal picture of the gods that was in part a Bronze-Age heritage. The gods of each city were influenced by the gods of poetry but never lost their particularity.

When a city was founded, shrines of the gods were marked out on the acropolis, and in the agora, and at points on the periphery. The first civic official of general occurrence, the *basileus* "king," had the task of coordinating ritual, gathering supplies of staple goods, and arranging assemblies and festivals. Every increase in territory and in population was signaled by new shrines and processions. As a city prospered, great temples were put under construction, far surpassing any secular buildings. Some were completed only after centuries—or never. But if a city failed under enemy attack, the gods as a matter of vivid belief picked up and left, withdrawing from city shrines to whatever place they came from. So it was that the ancient gods of nature joined Greek society when it began and developed with it, acquiring social functions. The gods of Athens became the gods of tragedy and replaced those of Homer.

Greek cities in raising life to a broad plateau of comfort and security also created the great divide between rich and poor; government was contested between aristocrats and tyrants, or between oligarchs and democrats. Strife within cities became as common as war between them, and war and civil strife often coincided, whether the hardship of war drove rich and poor apart, or either one was in league with the enemy outside. Public worship

posed special danger. In spring 392 b.c., at the festival of Artemis *eukleia* described by Xenophon from close acquaintance, the democrats of Corinth assailed their opponents as they performed the traditional ring dances in the agora, and then finished them as they sought refuge at the statues and altars nearby. Aeneas Tacticus, discussing stratagems of war in the mid-fourth century, has much to say of opportunities and precautions during festival celebrations in characteristic settings.

So it was prudent to reinforce such ties of worship as associate rich and poor in companionable activity. Theopompus records the judgment of the Delphic oracle that the ordinary man who faithfully attends each festival throughout the year is a better citizen than the magnate who brings a hecatomb to Apollo. Among the gods, some especially appealed to common folk and received the humblest of offerings. Families came to honor Zeus *milichios* at a huge picnic gathering in early spring, the legendary first sacrifice in Hesiod. His cult was always a means of reconciliation; hence the many local stories that it was somehow embroiled in tremendous conflict. Demeter, goddess of agriculture, brought the whole community together while it was still small; thereafter the Mysteries of Eleusis were the largest occasion anywhere, open to all at little cost, for parading and dancing and feasting, and also for assembling in silence. The effect they usually had may be judged from a moment of failure. In 403 B.C. the two factions contesting power at Athens took up their dead from the field under a brief truce. It was the Herald of the Mysteries, says Xenophon again, who seized this opportunity to remind them both of the sacrifices and processions they had shared.

The tablet of Selinus recruits a number of such deities in calendar order and fashions ritual for them that will be generally convenient and attractive. The inscription of Cyrene recruits only *Akamantes* and *Tritopateres*, but finds a great many ritual occasions that will engage rich and poor, and also old and new citizens. Both Selinus and Cyrene were governed by long-standing oligarchies at the time the tablet and the inscription were displayed. It was at other hands, in 409 and in 321 B.C., that the end came for both as independent cities. Stable government had endured at both even through years of war.

PART I

At Selinus, Rules throughout the Year

1

The Lead Tablet

Text

The physical form of the tablet, with its two columns upside down to each other and its curious means of attachment, is considered in [chapter 2](#). Here an attempt is made to establish the text and the literal meaning as securely as possible.

Column A

- 1 [αἴ τις κα λεί] ἀν[νέμεν], ἀ[παρχὴν ἐπιφερέτω τῷ Διί.]
2 [ἐξελέν] δὲ μᾶ[ζ]α[ν] τε ἅλα τε {κα} κάπ[ἀρχεσθαι τότον]
3 [ἐπίθν]μ[α] καταλ[ή]ιπόντας. κατ[ῆ]αιγίξεν δὲ τὸς ἡμοσεπέους.
4 -----rasura-----
5 -----rasura-----
6 -----rasura-----
7 τῶν ἡμαρῶν ἡα θυσία πρὸ Ὀστυλόν καὶ τᾶς ἐχεχερίας πάν[τοι]
8 φέτει ἡῶιπερ ἡόκα ἡα Ὀλυμπιάς ποτείε. τῷ Διί : τῷ εὐμειεὶ θύ[ε]ν καὶ
9 ταῖς : Εὐμειίδεσι : τέλεον καὶ τῷ Διὶ τῷ μιλιχί : τῷ : ἐν Μύσσο : τέλεον :
τοῖς Τρ-
10 ιτοπατρῆσι · τοῖς · μιανοῖς ἡόσπερ τοῖς ἡερόεσι φῶνον ἡυπολῆει-
11 ψας · δι' ὀρόφο · καὶ τᾶν μοιρᾶν · τᾶν ἐνάταν · κατακα-
12 ἴαν · μίαν. θνόντο θῦμα : καὶ καταγιζόντο ἡοῖς ἡοσία · καὶ περιρά-
13 ναντες καταλινάτο : κῆπειτα : τοῖς : καθαροῖς : τέλεον θνόντο : μελίκρατα
ἡυπο-
14 λείβον · καὶ τράπεζαν καὶ κλίαν κένβυλέτο καθαρὸν ἡῆμα καὶ στεφά-
15 νος ἐλαίως καὶ μελίκρατα ἐν καωαῖς ποτερίδε[σ]ι καὶ : πλάσματα καὶ κρᾶ · κατ-

16 ἀρξάμενοι κατακαάντο καὶ καταλιπάντο τὰς ποτερίδας ἐνθέντες.
 17 θυόντο ἡόσπερ τοῖς θεοῖς τὰ πατρώια : τοῖ ἐν Εὐθυδάμο : μιλιχίοι : κριόν θ[υ]-
 18 όντο. ἔστο δὲ καὶ θυμα πεδὰ Φέτος θύν. τὰ δὲ ἡιαρὰ τὰ δομόσια ἐξ<α>ιρέτο-
 καὶ τρά[πεζα]-
 19 ν : προθέμεν· καὶ ρολέαν καὶ τὰ πὸ τῆς τραπέζας : ἀπάργματα καὶ τὸ στέα κα[τα]-
 20 κῶιν· τὰ κρῦ μὲχφερέτο. κυλέτο [H]όντινα λῆι. ἔστω δὲ καὶ πεδὰ Φέτ[us] Ϝ-
 21 οῖοι θύν : σφαζόντο δὲ : κῶντερ[α] πρ[ὸ] ὑγαλμίον [ἐκλ]ρέ[αντες καάντο.
 ἐστ]-
 22 ο θυμὰ ἡότι κα προχορεῖ τὰ πατρώ[ια.] μῆξαιρ[έτο] τὰ ἡιαρὰ τὰ δομόσια. καὶ δό[-
 23 τ[ο] τ[ρί]οια πτοχῶι τρίτοι Φέτ[ει]. vacat
 24 ἔστο δὲ ἐ[ὑ]σύνβ[ολα] τὰ ἡιαρὰ. vacat
 vacat

Column B

1 [αῖ] κ' ἄνθρωπ[ο]ς [αὐτορέκ]τα[ς] ἐλ[ά]σπερον ἀποικα[θαίρεσθαι]
 2 [λ<ζ> ι,] προσιπὸν ἡόπο κα λῆι καὶ τῷ Φέ[τ]τος ἡόπο κα λῆι καὶ [τῷ] μυνός]
 3 ἡοπείο κα λῆι καὶ <τ>ἀμέραι ἡοπείαι κα λ<ε>ι, π{ο}ροσιπὸν ἡόπυι κα λῆι,
 καθαίρεσθ. [καὶ ἡν]-
 4 ποδεκόμενος ἀπονίβασθαι δότο κᾶκρατίξασθαι καὶ ἡάλα τῷ· αὐ[τῷ].
 5 [κ]αὶ θύσας τῷ Δι χοῖρον ἐξ αὐτῷ ἴτο καὶ πριστ{ι}ραφέςθο vacat
 6 καὶ ποταγορέσθο καὶ σῖτον ἡαιρέσθο καὶ καθενδέτο ἡόπε κ-
 7 α λῆι. αἱ τις κα λῆι ξενικὸν ἐ πατρώιον ἐ ἴπακουσὸν ἐ ἴφορατὸν
 8 ἐ καὶ χόντινα καθαίρεσθαι, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καθαίρεσθο vacat
 9 ἡόνπερ ἡούτορέκτας. ἐπεὶ κ' ἐλαστέρο ἀποκαθάρεται, vacat
 10 ἡιαρσίον τέλκον ἐπὶ τῷ βομῷ τῷ δαμασίῳ θύσας καθαρό-
 11 σ ἔστο. διορίζας ἡαλὶ καὶ χρυσῷ ἀπορανάμενος ἀπίτο.
 12 ἡόκα τῷ ἐλαστέροι χρέζει θύν, θύν ἡόσπερ τοῖς vacat
 13 ἀθανάτοισι. σφαζέτο δ' ἐς γᾶν. vacat
 vacat

Translation

Here and there, especially in column A, the document forgets a verb and alternates inconsequently between imperative and infinitive constructions and between indefinite singular and plural subjects. The translation Διέμpts to reproduce these features, in the hope of showing that they do not obscure the meaning. Restorations *exempli gratia* are indicated by square brackets, but not those giving the necessary sense.

Column A

1–6. [?If someone wishes to read this over, he shall bring firstlings to Zeus. ? Take out] ‘sop ’n salt’ [and make firstlings of them,] having

left [an offering upon the altar]. The persons of the household consecrate it. *[The next three lines are blank.]*

7–8. The offering of the sacrifices before the *Kotytia* and before the truce every fourth year in which the Olympiad comes round.

8–9. To Zeus *eumenês* and the *Eumenides* sacrifice a full-grown animal, and to Zeus *milichios* in [the land] of *Myskos* a full-grown animal.

9–13. To the *Tritopatreis* who are foul just as to the heroes, after pouring down wine through the roof, and of the portions that are ninth burn up one. Those who have the right shall sacrifice the victim and shall consecrate. And after sprinkling round they shall smear over.

13–17. And then to those who are pure they shall sacrifice a full-grown victim, pouring down honey-mix. And (one shall set up) a table and a couch, and one shall place thereon a clean cloth and crowns of olive and honey-mix in new cups and cakes and meat. And they shall burn them up as firstlings, and shall smear over after putting in the cups. They shall sacrifice just as to the gods the ancestral victims.

17–20. To *milichios* in [the land] of *Euthydamos* they shall sacrifice a ram. It is also allowed to sacrifice the victim every second year. One shall take out the holy objects that are public. And place the table in front. And burn up a thigh and the firstlings from the table and the bones. One shall not carry away the meat. One shall invite whomever he wishes.

20–24. It is also allowed to sacrifice at home every second year. They shall slay the animal. And they shall wash intestines and burn them up before statues. The victim shall be whatever the ancestral customs allow. One shall not take out [the holy objects that are public. And one shall give] threefold to a beggar in this third year. The omens shall be easy to understand. *[This clause is inscribed as an afterthought.]*

Column B

1–3. If a person wishes to be purified of an *elasteros* by slaying with his own hand, he shall announce wherever he wishes and whenever in the year he wishes and in whatever month he wishes and on whatever day he wishes, and shall announce in whatever direction he wishes, and shall set about being purified.

3–4. And he shall entertain to a meal, and provide washing and supping and salt for this same one.

5–7. And he shall sacrifice a piglet to Zeus, and shall go forth from there, and shall turn his back, and shall converse, and shall take food,

and shall sleep wherever he wishes.

7–8. If someone wishes to be purified of an *elasteros* that is entertained, or ancestral, or heard, or seen, or whomsoever, he shall be purified in the same way.

9–11. [The *last five lines are inscribed in larger letters.*] ...as the one slaying with his own hand. After one has been purified of an *elasteros*, he shall sacrifice a full-grown victim upon the public altar, and shall be pure. He shall mark a boundary with salt, and sprinkle round with a gold vessel, and go away.

12–13. Whenever one needs to sacrifice for the *elasteros*, sacrifice just as to the immortals. But one shall slay the animal with the blood running down to earth.

Notes on the Text

I have not seen the tablet and rely on JJK's full report and illustrations. On pages 8–13 they provide a diplomatic transcript; the frontispiece and plates 1–5 are excellent photographs; folding plates 1–2 are painstaking drawings. As Graham (1995, 367) remarks, “there are a disturbingly large number of differences” between transcript and drawings, and there are differences too between transcript and the text finally presented (JJK 14, 16). But these differing interpretations of a difficult inscription can serve to guide us.

Column A

1–3. I have restored these lines throughout, *exempli gratia*. This is the simplest means of showing the undoubted construction of lines 2–3 and the likely scope of them all. The actual words that stood in line 1 cannot of course be known. It is useful nonetheless to contemplate such words as might conceivably have stood there. JJK 8, 14, 18–20 print as text, and explicate, no more than line 3 after its lost beginning: in itself a counsel of wisdom. Yet they are free with conjecture about what went before (ibid. and 50–52, 61, 66, 114). It was a certain form of animal sacrifice; it involved another group besides the persons of the household; it had to do with homicide pollution; there was a heading to this effect. They also suggest that “funeral ceremonies” were mentioned as another obligation of each household. Parker (2004, 64) makes it a question whether the issuing authority was named. No such detail, not even one of them, can possibly be fitted in.

1. The hand that inscribed lines 1–3 and line 24 is different from

the rest of column A and again from column B; these lines are by way of amendment. The letters are mostly larger but sometimes crowded, sometimes widely spaced, and cancelled at least once (in line 3 the *h* of *κατ'ἡγουρίζεν* is written over *α*, to be followed by another *α*).

JJK 8, 14 read [.....]. *αν* [....] [- - -]. Before *αν*, the illegible letter is said to be a loop open to the left, either O or Θ it would be, and the drawing agrees. But the photograph (pl. 2) shows that the loop is very faint and also that another letter space intervenes. The loop seems inconsequential. At the top of the following space, on the edge of the tablet, is not a letter but a deep tear. Both letters have been entirely lost. Between *αν* and *α* JJK count four letters missing, but these termini are right above *μ* and *ε* in the next line, between which five letters will have intervened.

The line was occupied by a sentence complete in itself, for in the next line the connective *δέ* can be securely read and articulated after the first word. Here begins an infinitive clause, with two coordinate infinitives, reaching to the middle of line 3. The second half of line 3, another infinitive clause, rounds off the meaning. Prescriptive infinitives, then, for which the occasion was stated in line I as a heading, like the longer heading of column B.

In line 3 something is consecrated, i.e. burnt up upon an altar, by household members. Which altar it is would not be obvious unless the tablet was placed beside it. In column B “the public altar” is mentioned in line 10 without ado—it is an obvious choice, probably the same altar as here. The deity that follows from the context in column B is Zeus. Zeus typically has an altar in the agora that serves for general purposes, and altars also on the acropolis; agora or acropolis would be a natural place to display the tablet. More will be said in chapters 2 and 3 on behalf of these conjectures. Perhaps then the occasion here is the purposeful reading of the tablet, or rather of column A. The arrangement of the two columns upside down to each other ensures that only one column can be read at a given time.

Hence the suggestion

[*αἴ τις κα λῆι*] *ἀν[νέμεν]*, *ἀ[παρχὴν ἐπιφερέτω τῷ Δίῳ ὁ τῷ βομῶι]*

“if someone wishes to read this over”, i.e. make use of the tablet, “he shall bring firstlings to Zeus or to the altar.” It fits the traces, since the first supplement often letters, rather than nine, includes three instances of *ι*, the narrowest letter, and the second supplement is of five letters, as seems indicated. In [chapter 3](#) (pp. 49–51) we shall consider more carefully how the text must have begun. These words are the merest possibility. Quite different words may have stood here—but they will likewise have led directly to the next two lines.

2. JJK. 8. 14 read [...] . δεμα [.] α [.]
 τεηαλατερα [.] καιο [- - -]. Let us start at the end and work
 back.

As well as καιο JJK admit καπ, an alternative that is borne out by drawing and photograph. With the right-hand vertical will be, say JJK, “unusually long”—but it is still distinctly shorter than the left-hand vertical, as it should be with π, and it must accordingly be allowed that the left-hand vertical, whatever letter it may be, is unusually long. In this hand, such a Π is nothing to complain of. With the right-hand vertical is thought of as “curving slightly and continuing perhaps on the upper right, so that it could be interpreted as a relatively large O.” It would be a *very large* O. Was the reading suggested solely by a determination to make out the connective και

Before this, the close-up photograph (pl. 3) seems to show κα as much as πα, and there is very little space for a lost letter. I infer that the same two letters κα were mistakenly inscribed twice. For the sequence of letters ending here, JJK 8 also propose an alternative reading *ηολατερ = ὁ ἀλάτηρ*, to be understood as “a traveling religious expert.” Hesychius is wrongly cited for such a word; he glosses ἀλήτωρ, as Graham (1995, 367) points out. Anyway, it would be impossible to accommodate a nominative case. (It is curious that ἀλήτωρ was already introduced as an emendation in a passage of Aeschylus where the *elasteros* of column B now casts his shadow; see chapter 15 note 7).

Despite the pessimism of JJK, we have reached firm ground in line 2. Given the letters read, and they are plain enough, *δέ μα[ζ]α[ν] τε ηάλα τε* is the only possible restoration. It imposed itself at once on JJK, but they excluded it from their text because the following letters made no sense and because the connective τε is not used elsewhere in the document. The latter objection would be decisive, were it not that *μαζαν τε ἄλα τε* is likely to be a proverbial phrase that could not be avoided—“sop ‘n’ salt” is meant to convey this. In column B line 13 the tablet adopts the poetic form *ἀθανάτοισι*, habitual language of a different kind.

The construction in this line and the next is the infinitive with accusative subject if expressed. Whereas the second half of line 3 consists of a short clause of this kind, line 2 and the first half of 3 consist of a longer one. Here too the first word, before the connective δέ, was undoubtedly an infinitive, e.g. [ἐξελεῖν]. The last preserved letters toward the end of the line are καπ. If we look down to line 15, the very last letters, in a different hand, are also καπ, the beginning of *καπ-/αρξάμενοι*. In line 3 the last word must be an infinitive, coordinate with the initial infinitive. It may be *καπ[άρχεσθαι]*, to be

completed with **τότον**, i.e. offer firstlings of the barley sop and of salt. If so, the initial two letters have indeed been written twice: {κα}κ^απ[άρχεσθαι].

3. In the first half of the line JJK 8, 14 read **....] . β/μ . καταλ[.]ίποντας** etc. The participle might be either **καταλ[ε]ίποντας** or **καταλ[η]ιπόντας**. The first spelling is authorized by **ηνπο-/λείβον** in line 14, the second by **ύπολχει-/ψας** in line 10. JJK call the aorist “more appropriate” but give the present in their text and are followed by Lupu (2005, no. 27). The aorist is better, the more so if the different tenses in lines 10 and 14 convey different meanings, as we might expect.

For the letter that survives before this, the drawing and the photograph (pl. 2) show three slanting strokes to be taken as either “a complete *B* or the right-hand part of a *M*.” In the context, **[ἐπιθυ]μ[α]** is a reasonable venture; the original sense of **ἐπιθύω** is “offer upon [an altar]” (Casabona 1966, 98).

4–6. These lines were first inscribed and then imperfectly erased, as noted by JJK 5–6, 9. The drawing shows the letter traces, and the close-up photograph (pl. 3) is largely a view of the erasure. The letters that can be made out are smaller than those of the lines before and after—but perhaps only as an effect of erasure, i.e. of smoothing down the surface, as JJK explain and as they demonstrated by doing the same with clay. JJK suggest first that these lines were inscribed by the same hand as lines 7–24; afterwards, and surprisingly, that they belong to an earlier inscription.

The erasure can be better explained. JJK’s first alternative is prompted by the view, which can hardly be right, that line 7 begins with a sentence fragment. It is likely enough, however, that the original lines 4–6 were by the same hand as the following lines. Now line 24, the very last, was in fact inscribed by a different hand from 7–23, as we shall see: it is a later addition. It may well be due to the same second thoughts as the erasure. And the hand of line 24 resembles the hand of lines 1–3, if resemblance can be gauged from the few letters in question. Perhaps then the erasure was of lines 1–6 of an earlier version, inscribed by the same hand as lines 7–23, so that the later version is only half as long.

7–23. These lines are all by one hand. A notable feature is the single and double points sometimes used between words. Single points occur in lines 10, 11, 12, 14, 20; double in lines 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21. So they are mostly used in alternate lines by way of decoration. They give no help at all in articulating phrases or clauses.

7. A deadline is announced, as a fresh start, for all the rites that follow. But JJK 15, 20–23 find difficulty with the first four words as a noun phrase, and prefer to think that they continue a sentence begun

in the erasure. The meaning, and the question whether something essential to it has been lost in the erasure, are discussed in [chapter 4](#) (pp. 53–56).

8. JJK 28 take ποτείε as the optative -είη of εἰμί *sum*, but it is rather the Doric subjunctive -είη < ι > of εἶμι *ibo*, like e.g. εἶω in Sophron fr. 47 K-A, as pointed out by Dubois (1995a, 558; 1995b, 132–33). The meaning is scarcely affected.

9. It is argued in [chapter 8](#) (pp. 130–34) that χόροι “land” is to be understood in the elliptic phrases ἐν Μύσσο and ἐν Εὐθυδάμο (line 17). There too the meaning of these names as common nouns, “pollution” and “regular citizen,” is adopted from ancient lexica (similarly Curti and van Bremen [1999, 31]).

9–18. These lines prescribe sacrifice to two kinds of *Tritopatreis*. The text is secure throughout, and both the literal meaning and the general purpose are obvious and agreed, except for the ambiguities to be mentioned.

9–11. “To the *Tritopatreis*,” etc., the first clause of a new section, has no verb or object, only a dangling participle. We must supply “[sacrifice a victim],” unspecified, as indicated resumptively in line 12, together with “consecrate,” which was in fact mentioned as “burn up.” The ellipse is explained and justified by Clinton (1996, 170–71), Scullion (2000, 163–64), and Parker (2005a, 43), as against JJK 31, who prefer to say that the two victims of the previous section serve also for the *Tritopatreis*. This does not agree with the general format and does not even account for the ellipse.

11–12. The feminine endings up to μίαν will be genitive plural, as argued by JJK 15, 31, though Parker (2005a, 43) registers some doubt. By the usual convention JJK print ἐνάταν, as do others since, and so do I. But the Doric accent is more likely ἐνατᾶν (cf. Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 1.384).

12. Cf. 17, 18, 22. In line 12 JJK render θυνόντο θῦμα as “perform sacrifice,” and in line 17 θυνόντο . . . τὰ πατρῷα as “perform the ancestral sacrifices,” and in line 18 θῦμα . . . θύεν as “sacrifice” (intransitive), and in lines 21–22 θυνόντ]ο θῦμα ἥοτι κτλ as “[sacrifice] whatever sacrifice” etc. But θῦμα means “victim” throughout; cf. Clinton (1996, 170, 173) apropos of lines 12 and 18. In line 17 τὰ πατρῷα means “the ancestral (victims)”; elsewhere, in line 22, it means “the ancestral (customs).” To “perform sacrifice” or to “sacrifice” (intransitive) would be expressed by θύω alone, as in line 21, ῥοῖοι θύεν “to sacrifice at home.” As a general rule, whenever θῦμα follows θύω, it refers to a particular “victim,” often qualified: cf. *LSJ* s.v. θῦμα I. I. Casabona (1966) gives no instance of θῦμα θύω as cognate accusative. It is also to be objected

that JJK's rendering of lines 21–22 is much too general in the context of these detailed instructions: “[Let them sacrifice] whatever sacrifice the ancestral customs permit.”

13,16. *καταλινάντο* is rendered “anoint” by JJK 15, 33–35; so too Clinton (1996, 170). Rather, “smear over” the wet ashes into a coating, as argued in chapters 10 (pp. 162–64) and 19 (pp. 295, 297).

13–15. Some care is needed in the articulation of clauses. Two main clauses are readily distinguished: *κέπειτα...θυόντο* “and then... they shall sacrifice” and *κένβαλέτο...κρᾶ* “and one shall place thereon... meat.” Plural and singular verbs alternate inconsequently. After *κέπειτα...θυόντο* the singular participle *ὑπολείβον* “pouring down (honey-mix)” must accompany the act of sacrifice, like *ὑπολθείψας* in lines 10–11, where the act of sacrifice is not expressed; it is a further alternation of plural and singular. And after this, *καὶ τράπεζαν καὶ κλίναν* must constitute a new clause with a verb understood, e.g. *παράθετο / παραθέντο*: “and one / they shall set up a table and couch.” JJK 15, Clinton (1996, 170), and Lupu (2005, 363) all conjoin the libation and the preparation of the table, quite improbably.

15–16. *καὶπαρξάμενοι κατακαάντο* “and they shall burn them up as firstlings.” As JJK 69 observe, the form of words in lines 19–20 conveys the same meaning, “burn up... the firstlings from the table.” It is a new clause, and in translating I place a full stop before it. JJK 15 use a semicolon but leave the Greek text without any punctuation. JJK 15 and Jameson (1994, 43) and Clinton (1996, 170) all translate “and having made offerings let them burn (them),” which comes to the same thing.

17. As to the meaning “sacrifice... victims” see line 12 above. Sacrifice “just as to the gods” matches sacrifice “just as to the heroes” (line 10). But is it the preceding sacrifice to the pure *Tritopatreis* that is so labeled or the following one to *milichios* The preceding one, say JJK 36 and Ekroth (2002, 236). The following one, say Georgoudi (2001) and Henrichs (2005, 55). Henrichs asks accordingly how sacrifice to the pure *Tritopatreis* is to be regarded. On the other view, we might ask how sacrifice to *milichios* is to be regarded. In fact, the question is decided by syntax: the label goes with what precedes. Each of the entries in lines 8–24 begins with the deity or deities in the dative, this one with *τοῖ ἐν Εὐθυδάμο μιλιχίοι*. Furthermore, if it began *θυόντο* *ὡςπερ κτλ*, the next *θ[υ]/όντο* would be redundant.

17 *med.*-24. These lines prescribe sacrifice to *milichios*, i.e. Zeus *milichios*, in his public sanctuary and then at home. The text is secure down to line 20, though in line 18 a verb is rendered enigmatic by misspelling.

18. ἐξήριετο is clear but somehow misspelt. It is similar to μῆξαιρ[in line 22. Both words follow mention of sacrifice, θύμα... θύεν and ἔστ]-/ο θύμα; they are likely to be the same. For ἐξήριετο, JJK 21–23 (on line 7) entertain the ἐκ- compound of either αἶρω (ἀείρω) or αἰρέω or εἶρω (originally εἶρω, They even canvass ἐξήι <κ> έτο “let him go out” after Dubois and Masson, which leaves τὰ hiarà without construction. Only αἰρέω can explain the two forms. The verb in both places is ἐξαιρήτω <ἐξαιρέω.

It remains to establish the literal meaning of this short sentence, τὰ δὲ hiarà τὰ δαμόσια ἐξ<α>ίρετο; extended discussion is required. A seeming analogy must be dismissed, as it was by JJK 21. ἐξαιρεῖν τὰ ἱερά “extract the organs” is a standard phrase when the organs of a sacrificial victim are used as omens (Xen. *Anab.* 2.1.9; cf. Hdt. 2.40.1). In line 24 an inevitable restoration, ἐὺσύμβ[ολ- “easy to understand,” inevitably points to τὰ hiarà as organs and omens. Yet to describe them here as τὰ δαμόσια “(those) that are public” gives no satisfactory sense. The instructions are for a private sacrifice, whether it takes place in a public sanctuary or at home.

The term τὰ hiarà is protean and takes its meaning from the context. In line 4 it is “the victims” as object of sacrifice; in line 24, where the term is implicit and doubtless to be restored, it is “the omens”; here it is certain ritual objects that are to the fore. Images of Zeus *milichios*, say JJK 21–23, cf. 38, 67, 70, 102. They accordingly render “take out the public sacred objects”; so too Clinton (1996, 163, 173, 174). This interpretation suits the context, as we shall see in a moment, though the objects are not quite what JJK suppose. (JJK also favor “sacred objects” in line 4, but here it goes against the context). Other ventures can be set aside. Graham (1995, 367) says “remove the public sacrificial victims,” presumably to clear the way for a private sacrifice. Parker (1996, 5III7) associates the phrase with Athenian texts both epigraphic and literary and one from Halicarnassus, in which sacrificial victims are said to be “Public” in the sense of being publicly funded.

After taking out the *hiara* that are public, “place a table in front.” The table is laid with food offerings that are afterward burnt up (lines 19–20). It is a common practice to present food offerings to a statue of a god. The stones inscribed for Zeus *milichios* at many places are virtual statues; at Selinus, in his sanctuary on *Gaggera*, a great many stones were found in situ, though only a few are inscribed; recent excavation has shown that offerings were made among the stones. The act of “taking out,” however, cannot refer to stones fixed in the

ground. JJK think of certain public statues that are kept apart, as in a building, and are portable, perhaps fashioned of wood. And yet public statues separate from the rest, or even one public statue, if the plural embraced other equipment, would seem counter to the spirit of this worship, in which every single stone, a virtual statue, belongs to an individual owner or owners, as we see from the inscriptions.

Instead, we should understand the *hiara* to be the table, mentioned straightway, and the table service, the vessels and plates. These are public articles that will enhance the private occasion. Such a meaning is borne out by the sequel. The sacrifice in the public sanctuary contrasts with a lesser sacrifice at home (lines 20–21), where we find a contrasting prohibition: “one shall not take out [the holy objects that are public]” (line 22). The sacrifice at home entails a visit to the sanctuary, where “intestines” are either placed or burnt up as a token offering “before *agalмата*,” the *milichios* stones (line 21). The table and utensils are not made available for the lesser occasion. (JJK, it should be noted, do not thus interpret the sacrifice at home.)

19–21 *init.* The reading is secure and the meaning plain. For *ἅ-οῖοι* Clinton (1996, 174) suggests as a possible alternative “at (the) *oikos*,” some building so called, “perhaps the building in which the *hiara* were kept, or even a temple.” The locative form, however, elsewhere means “at home” and would hardly be used in this unexpected way.

21. JJK render *σφαζόντο δέ :* as “let them slaughter” and supply an object, the sacrificial victim, among the problematic letters which follow. But the very next word seems to be *καί* in crasis, introducing another clause. Rather, “they shall slay (the animal),” i.e. with their own hands. This comes right after the rule *Φοίροι θύεν* “sacrifice at home” because animals, rather than cereal or other vegetable dishes, are not commonly offered up at someone’s home, or at least at a very modest home such as we envisage here. It is likely to be a small animal, maybe a sucking pig. The slaying also leads to an important point about the disposition of the victim’s remains, “wash intestines” etc.

σφάζω means more specifically “pierce the throat” so as to make the blood run out, and at B 13 *σφαζέτο ἐς γὰρ* follows *θύεν* as an extra detail because the destination of the blood is important.

After *σφαζόντο δέ :* two letters are overwritten, and the next four are squeezed together. The difficulties lead JJK 10, 14, 39–40 to print *καομπεο[...]*ο as a noncommittal reading in their text and to suggest that *καί βο[ν πρ]δ* was intended. This conjecture, though accepted by Dubois (1995b, 137–38), does not explain the existing letters very well, and an ox, as JJK admit, is surprising.

καῖντερ[α πρ]ὸ seems a natural reading and restoration of the letters. The letters κα are written over το, of which only faint traces remain. JJK agree on this, so that α as a cancelled letter should not appear in their text. To judge from the photograph (pl. 2) rather than the drawing, the next letter is N, three strokes, rather than, four strokes. The letter before the breach is Q [only if it was placed very high. It does better as the top of P[, the two legs being lost. Admittedly, it should not be slightly bowed or rounded on the left—but Q should be fully rounded. Perhaps the lead has been distorted by the breach.

Thereafter, πρ]ὸ ἀγαλμάτων “before statues” is inevitable. In this context of worshipping Zeus *milichios*, “statues” can only be *milichios* stones. After ἀγαλμάτων all that can be read is [...] . εσ[. The uncertain letter is the curving right side of either Ο or Θ or Δ. Intestines are typically washed or rinsed: τάντερ ἔχ-/σο κλύζει[ε] (IG I³ 982.1–2. Vari cave). ε[ντ-/ [ερ]α δε ἐκπλύναντες παρὰ τὸ[μ βωμόν κα]ρπώντι (LSCG 151A 33–34. Cos, festival of Zeus *polieus*). [ἐκλ]οέσ[αντες] fits well. (λωσάμεν[ος] occurs in Cyrene’s rules of sacrifice, line 12, but λοεσ- will be the original form.) A participial form is indicated since there must also be an action, the main verb, suited to the location “before statues.”

Perhaps they “burn up” the intestines as an offering, καάντο. So they do on Cos (*loc. cit.*), and “beside the altar,” as here “before statues.” Or perhaps they merely “set down” the offering, θέντο. προθέντο seems too long; likewise, any alternative actions “before statues.” In the next line, the first clause must begin with another imperative verb ending in -ο. After either καάντο or θέντο, ἐστ-]/ο fills the space nicely.

22. Whereas a ram, a rather costly victim, is prescribed for the sacrifice at the sanctuary (line 17), a wider choice is allowed at home, by way of economy it seems. θῦμα, we must remember, is the “victim,” not the “sacrifice” in a general sense (cf. line 12 above). As JJK remark, προχωρεῖ is used like ἐγχωρέω and ἐπιχωρέω, both meaning “permit.” With those two verbs, the sense follows from the prepositions ἐν and ἐπί. The same sense is not otherwise Δίεστος, nor is it natural, for προχωρέω. The meaning is rather “pass current” (LSJs.v. I 2; LSJ I 3, with LSJRev. Suppl., “sell” for a certain price, comes to the same thing). It is as if two ways of speaking have been run together, the other being ὅτι κα προχωρεῖ κατὰ τὰ πατρώια “whatever passes current according to ancestral customs.”

After τὰ πατρώια, another sentence begins. According to JJK

11, 14, there is space for two letters, then “the upper right angle of ϵ or the top of a curved letter, $\omicron$ or θ , rather angular,” followed by $\epsilon\xi\alpha\iota$ and “the top left angle of ϵ , π , or p .” Hence JJK’s $\mu\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\iota\rho[\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron]$, i.e. $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\eta}\tau\omega$ (they wrongly accent $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\iota\rho[\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron]$)—which presupposes that there is space for just one letter before the first ϵ . But the analogy of $\mu\epsilon\chi\varphi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron$ in line 20 requires $\mu\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\iota\rho[\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron]$. This fits the traces perfectly since the letter JJK describe as a possible ϵ may be just as well the two right strokes of μ , and the two left strokes will take up the seeming letter space.

The restoration entails $\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \eta\iota\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$ as object; the prohibition is the opposite of $\acute{\epsilon}\xi<a>\varphi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron$ in line 18. On this lesser occasion, “one shall not take out the holy objects that are public.” The table service is not made available. If we supply $\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \eta\iota\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\grave{\alpha}\ \delta\alpha\mu\acute{o}\sigma\iota\alpha$ as the likely object of the verb, the clause thus completed fills the space, together with the likely beginning of the next clause.

23. The reading appears to be $\tau[...]\iota\omicron\iota\alpha\pi\tau\omicron\chi\omicron\iota\tau\rho\iota\tau\omicron\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau[...]$. JJK 11 describe the traces of the fourth letter as the round top of either $\omicron$, θ , δ , or ρ . The traces at the end are inconsistently reported, as between $\acute{\epsilon}\tau[...]\iota$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\tau[...]\epsilon$. The transcript speaks of “the lower tip of a vertical,” arguably ι , but the drawing shows three strokes forming an unrecognizable letter, arguably $\acute{E}$. The photograph (pl. 2) suggests rather that after $\acute{\epsilon}\tau[...]$ no definite trace remains. In any case, this word was certainly $\acute{\acute{\epsilon}}\tau\epsilon\iota$, and almost certainly it was the last in the clause.

JJK II suggest, without much conviction, two quite different ways of partially restoring the clause. One is

$[- - - - \acute{\epsilon}\sigma - / \tau[o\ \tau]\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\iota\alpha\ \pi\tau\omicron\chi\acute{\omicron}\iota$, said to be “a sacrifice with three components” and “perhaps a laconic way of providing an alternative to the expensive *bos* we have suggested for line 21.” The *bos* was a very long shot, as we have seen. A sacrifice with three components is another very long shot and also seems remarkably unsuited to “beggar”—to whom or what $\pi\tau\omicron\chi\acute{\omicron}\iota$ refers remains mysterious.” It cannot evoke a person or household of modest means since a poor man and a beggar were always distinguished. The other suggestion is $\tau[\acute{\omicron}\iota]\ \Delta\grave{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\iota\ \acute{A}\pi\tau\acute{o}\chi\omicron\iota$, said to be “a new but not unreasonable epithet... for the guardian of household wealth.” JJK speak of the cult of Zeus *ktêsios*. Dubois (1995b, 138) entertains the epithet but deduces a different meaning from its etymology, “without fear.” All these proposals have an air of desperation.

I restore and translate $\delta\acute{o}[\tau[o\ \tau]\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\iota\alpha\ \pi\tau\omicron\chi\acute{\omicron}\iota\ \tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\iota\ \acute{\acute{\epsilon}}\tau[...]$ “[And one shall give] threefold to a beggar in this third year.” The two $\tau\rho\iota\tau\omicron\iota$ words have a magic assonance that disappears in English

if the latter phrase is translated “in the second year (aforementioned),” which is the actual meaning by inclusive reckoning. Fuller argument must be left to [chapter 12](#) (pp. 194–97).

If another clause followed at once, it would continue into the next line. But there the hand is different. Column A originally ended at this point until the next line was inscribed by another hand.

24. JJK II, 14 read (.)] *ευσυνβ* [- - - - and suggest *ευσύνβ[ολος* or - [*λητος* with the meaning “easy to divine or understand,” “auspicious” (= *LSJs. ευσύμβολος* I, III). The undotted letters are perfectly clear, and the dotted ones are reasonable. Instead of β, they say, ια is possible, and the photograph as against the drawing shows that this ι does not slant unduly. Yet their first preference and their partial restoration are justified not only by the traces and by Greek vocabulary but also by the context of sacrifice. The words *ευσύμβλητος, ευσύμβολος* are used mostly of portents and omens (other meanings are secondary or contrived). Here it will be the omens taken at sacrifice, *τὰ hiarά* in another sense. Omens do in fact play a part in the worship of Zeus *milichios*, as will be mentioned in [chapter 12](#).

Though JJK 5, II do not remark it, the inscribing hand is different from before but similar to lines 1–3. The letters are much larger than in lines 7–23. They are also, in contrast to line I, quite level but perhaps only because the bottom edge offered a sure guide. Something was added later. More likely than not, the added clause started afresh in this line.

The line is easily completed to give the meaning “the omens shall be easy to understand.” At the beginning, JJK count 7–8 letters as lost. Measured by the line before, the count seems right, but larger letters would be fewer. Perhaps then *ἔστο δέ]*, 6 letters. rather than *εἶμεν δέ]*, 7 letters. Either *ἔστο / εἶμεν δέ] ευσύνβ[ολα / ευσύνβ[λετα τὰ hiarά* *or hiarά δέ] ευσύνβ[ολα / ευσύνβ[λετα ἔστο / εἶμεν* can be mooted. The word order is indifferent to the emphasis, and “omens” as subject might be left indefinite, like e.g. *θῦμα* “victim” in line 22.

Why is it so stipulated, and why does it occur as an afterthought? Whereas a ram is sacrificed at the public sanctuary, at home the choice of victim is left open for the sake of economy. A small animal like a piglet, a choice attested for Zeus *milichios*, will have small organs that may be hard to scrutinize. The problem only became apparent after the rules were put to use.

In column B, the inscriber has stretched out a shorter text so that it occupies as much space as possible. His efforts are clearly seen in JJK's reproductions—in folding plate 2, the drawing, and in plates 4–5, two close-up photographs taken in direct and in raking light. When he ruled the lines as the first step, he made the space fairly even for each line, right through the whole column. But as he proceeded to inscribe, he made the letters ever larger. In the last five lines, 9–13, they are as high as the lines allow or even protrude beyond them. And lines 5, 8, 9, and 12 are left short. See the comment on line 9, seemingly a fresh start.

1. The text and meaning of the first line are crucial. JJK 12, 16 present the reading of this line and the beginning of the next as

[. . (.)] . . ἀνθρώπος [. (.)] . . τ . [. . . (.)]

λαστεροναποκα [- - - / . .]. They describe further uncertainties and

hesitate between three possible restorations: [αἴ τ]ις ἀνθροπός

[κα λῆι α]πὸ τῶ[ν ἐλ]αστέρον ἀποκα[θαίρεσθ-/αι], or

[αἴ] κ' ἀνθροπος [τὸν αὖ]τῶ [ἐλ]αστέρον

ἀποκα[θαίρεσθαι] / λῆι], or [αἴ] κ' ἀνθροπος

[αὐτορέκ]τα[ς ἐλ]αστέρον ἀποκα [θαίρεσθαι / λῆι]. They do not explain, however, why their estimate of the space and the traces

before ἀνθροπος varies markedly between the first alternative and the others. The drawing and the photograph (pl. 4) support the

shorter estimate and a reading and restoration αἴ κ' ἀνθροπ[ο]ς. At

the end of the line, space quite suffices for ἀποκα[θαίρεσθαι] entire.

At the beginning of the next line, there is barely space for two letters,

and we must posit either the misspelling λ<ε>ι as in line 3 or a word division λ-/εἰ] similar to that in lines 6–7.

The main difficulty comes in the middle of the line, in the word

or words to be restored around T. JJK's readings and restorations fluctuate again. And the drawing shows οτο, which is certainly far

too explicit; the photograph warrants rather τα. So the traces do not

favor either α]πὸ τῶ[ν ἐλ]αστέρον or [τὸν αὖ]τῶ [ἐλ]αστέρον. As

to sense, the plural form ἐλαστέρον, appearing also in JJK's third alternative, though it need not, is inconsistent with the indefinite singulars of lines 7–9 and the collective singular of line 12. Burkert

(2000, 209, cf. 207) suggests [ἀνθρό]π[ο ἐλ]άστερον with the meaning “the ghost of a man”—another man it will be. But he does not Δίεμψ to justify the reading π.

[αὐτορέκ]τα[ς] is to be preferred. As JJK 12, 40, 54 remark, the

resumptive phrase *ῥόνπερ ῥούτορέκτας* in line 9 implies a previous occurrence of the word. (They also envisage “a synonymous term,” and Schwabl (1996, 284) looks for “a pronouncement corresponding to the concept *autorektas*,” but nothing else can be fitted in.) This line of restoration has been subsequently favored, as by Dubois (1995a, 560; 1995b, 138), and Clinton (1996, 175–76), and Giuliani (1998, 81).

ἐλ]άστερον will be accusative singular, not genitive plural. In lines 7–8, the same form is understood with *καθαίρεσθαι*, another present infinitive. In line 9, *ἐλαστέρο ἀποκαθάρεται* is a genitive of separation governed by the perfective aorist, expressing the result of the procedure, as explained by Burkert (2000, 208).

JJK render *αὐτορέκτας* as “homicide,” and most agree. Giuliani (1998, 78) and a few others before him make it in effect “perpetrator” (of a major offense); to this Burkert (2000, 207, 212) rightly objects. The meaning “homicide” has dictated the interpretation of column B and has favored a corresponding interpretation of column A. In line I, however, the meaning can stand only if the term is attributive, going with the subject *ἄνθρωπος*. It should then be attached by the article, producing the form *ῥούτορέκτας* as in line 9—but here the space is not sufficient.

Instead, *αὐτορέκτας* goes with *ἐλάστερον ἀποκαθαίρεσθαι* as a predicate referring to the ritual, “slaying with one’s own hand.” Now the ritual that is so described—in line I and again in line 9—involves the sacrifice of a small animal and also (as we shall see) a special use of the meat. Other sacrifices follow in lines 10 and 13–14, but they differ markedly. The person being purified must slay the small animal with his own hand. A certain form of purification at Cyrene is distinguished by the same requirement, with the equivalent term *αὐτόφονος* (chapter 22, pp. 364–65). (In column A, line 21, the rule “they shall slay the animal” is merely incidental to a sacrifice at home, where the animal is likely to be a small one.)

For the word *ἐλάστερος*, the meaning “striker,” i.e. lightning as harbinger of pollution, is argued in chapter 15 (pp. 232–35).

2. JJK 13 report, and the drawing shows, that the bracketed letters of *προειπὸ(ν ῥόπο κα)ῖει* are written over *ῥόπε κα ῖει*, which was cancelled. In the first Δύempt the inscriber forgot the last letter of *προειπὸν*, and this word was too important to be left incomplete. *ῥόπε* recurs as *ῥόπει* in line 6: Selinus used this form, i.e. *ῥπη* or *ῥπηι*, as well as *ῥόπο* (i.e. *ῥπω*). According to JJK 41,

cf. 59–60, “the coexistence of ὅπου and ὅπει may indicate that the sources of these instructions are not entirely local.” But as textual variants in line 2 they cannot come from different sources and must be completely interchangeable.

ῥόπο is announced first, then τῷ ἔτεος ῥόπο. ῥόπο alone, written over ῥόπε, is naturally taken as “wherever” the rite is be conducted, though JJK 41 think too of “ὅπω = ὀπόθεν” as referring to “the source of proclamation.” I do not quite understand this; if the source of proclamation is either the person making it or the reason he is acting, it cannot be as “he wishes.” The next phrase is naturally taken as “whenever in the year” and is so translated by JJK.

At the end of the line JJK 16 restore [τοῦ μηνός] with virtual certainty. “Whenever in the year” is merely the *season*; month and day give the time more closely. The month is not “redundant,” as JJK 41 have it, nor need we resort to “καὶ explicativum,” as does Schwabl (1996, 285). The supposed difficulty leads JJK to suggest that ῥόπο is “a mistake for ῥοπέο,” meaning “in whatever year he wishes.” But as Schwabl says, we cannot suppose that the rite would be deferred so long.

3. <ταῖ> ἀμέραι JJK 16, <τ>ἀμέραι or <θ>ἀμέραι Schwabl (1996, 285). Certainly not <θ>ἀμέραι, for this word is never aspirated but in Attic. Otherwise, it is fortunate that the choice is hypothetical, for it cannot be decided. καί represents the only diphthong elsewhere found in crasis, as in κακρατίξασθαι in line 4 and χῶντινα in line 8, and in the practice of two colleagues in the other column. who give us καπ [(A 2), κῆπειτα (A 13), κένβαλέτο (A 14), καπ-/ αρξάμενοι (A 15–16), and κᾶντερ[α (A 21). But there is no other instance of -αι before a vowel or of any diphthong before a like vowel.

After ἀμέραι the inscriber erased a first attempt, κα λῆι καὶ ῥοπέαι κα λῆι, and wrote instead (ῥοπέαι κα λ<ε>ι π[ο}ροειπὸν ῥόπ)υι. One repetition was removed, but another introduced, the same participle as before.

The lacuna at the end of the line is unfortunate. In the next line someone provides a hospitable meal, but in such a context there are two possibilities. Either the person being purified provides a meal for the *elasteros*, or a second person provides a meal for the person being purified. JJK 16–17, 41–42, 54–56 adopt the first procedure in their text and commentary but do allow for the second (56n2). They present the reading [...(.) *hv*], showing doubt as between three or

four letters lost, and say further “there may have been room for a *καί*” (41), i.e. the first procedure. For the alternative *ho δέ*, the second procedure, still more room is needed, though they do not say so (56n2). The hiatus is paralleled in either case by *καὶ ἅλα* in line 4 or by *δὲ ἡιαρὰ* in A 18. Clinton (1996, 176) proposes [*καὶ ho hv-/ποδεκόμενος*, the second procedure; Curti and van Bremen (1999, 32–33) are Δύtracted, but it is very doubtful that space suffices. Clinton relies on the calculation he makes for the following line, on which see below. Burkert (2000, 211) offers shorter supplements on behalf of the second procedure—either [*ho hv-*] or [*ho-*], apparently by crasis, both with asyndeton, or again [*χο-*], “in crasis with *καί*.” Schwabl (1996, 285) prefers [*εἴτ’ hv-/ποδεκόμενος*, a variant of the first procedure, meaning that it is optional.

[*καὶ hv-/ποδεκόμενος* is the best choice for space and language. It will be argued in chapter 14 that it is a necessary choice, so as to give a purifying ritual addressed to the *elasteros*, as distinct from the ensuing sacrifices to Zeus.

4. At the end of the line I follow JJK 13, 16, 42 in restoring *τοῖ αὐ[τοῖ* “for this same one,” i.e. the *elasteros* who is behind the elaborate announcement of lines 2–3. If the second procedure is in view, it is the person being purified, an awkward expression. Instead of *αὐ[τοῖ*, Clinton (1996, 175) restores *αὐ[τορέκται* entire, and Curti and van Bremen (1999, 33) again find this Δύractive, though doubting that it fits. There is definitely not room for eight letters. The final letters of line 6, *ho πευκ*, extend farthest of all, farther even than *καθαρο* in line 10, where the inscriber renounced the final *s*. In line 4 the space after *αυ* is barely as much as those six letters take in line 6. It would be possible to divide the word between this line and the next as *αὐ[τορέκ-/τ]αι*, but then *θύσας κτλ* lacks a connective.

5–13. The text of the remaining lines is secure. The ritual unfolds step by step and is minutely prescribed, more so than anything in column A.

5. I render *ἐξ αὐτῷ ἵτο* “go forth from there”; similarly JJK, “go out from it.” The person leaves the place that he specified in the announcement, the place where the promised ritual has been conducted, a hospitable meal for the *elasteros* together with a sacrifice to Zeus. Burkert (1999, 30–31; 2000, 207, 211) takes *ἐξ αὐτῷ* with *θύσας* and translates “from his own” and explains that “the purificand himself” is to bear the cost of sacrifice, “a basic question.”

But the reflexive form would be needed, *ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ*, or more likely the phrase *ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου οἱ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων*.

5 fin.-7 *init*. An emphatic sequence of imperative verbs joined by *καί*, a different style from all the rest. The meanings “turn one’s back” and “converse” will be argued in [chapter 14](#) (pp. 218–20).

7–8. Whereas the opening line refers to an *elasteros* quite off-handedly, several kinds of *elasteros* are now specified—that is entertained, or ancestral, or heard, or seen—and are summed up as any kind at all, “whomsoever”. An *elasteros* that is entertained is one invited to a rite of table hospitality, as in lines 3–7. Other kinds are plausibly described by other terms appropriate to this power of nature.

The meaning of this sentence is complete at the end of line 8; the first words of line 9 are redundant. Note too that line 8 is left short at the end of a clause (as was line 5, ending with the clause “turn right round”).

9–13. These lines are inscribed in uniformly larger letters. After the business that was complete in lines 1–8, new business is added as an afterthought. So column B falls into two parts, earlier and later. The style differs in the following respect. In the first part, successive steps are introduced by *καί*: “and he shall entertain” etc. (line 3), “and he shall sacrifice” etc. (line 5). In the second part, asyndeton is the rule, apart from contrasting *δὲ* at the last (line 13).

9. The comparative phrase “as the one slaying with his own hand” serves as a bridge. The *ἐπεὶ* clause is another bridge, but introduces what follows: “after he has been purified of an *elasteros*, / he shall sacrifice” etc. Whereas lines 1, 3, and 8 give us the present tense “be purified” with the accusative of respect, line 9 gives us the aorist with the genitive of separation—it is a completed action (on this point see Burkert [2000, 208, 215n4]).

The sentence of lines 7–8, which gave a complete sense, now continues into line 9 with a redundant comparison, “as the one slaying with his own hand.” The *ἐπεὶ* clause as the beginning of the next sentence is also redundant. Furthermore, the line ends short, at the end of the *ἐπεὶ* clause. The ensuing four lines offer a further procedure.

10–11. After the blank space at the end of line 9, the ritual makes a fresh start. Another sacrifice is prescribed—of a full-grown victim, not a piglet, and “on the public altar,” not at a place individually chosen and announced. The leave-taking is marked by two expressive actions grander than the two before. By acting thus the person “shall be pure.” The previous rite of purification is reinforced.

12. “Whenever one needs to sacrifice for the *elasteros*” etc.

Henrichs (2005, 56) renders “whenever a sacrifice to the *elasteros* is required,” but *χρῆζει* is a personal verb. Now this indefinite temporal clause is plainly resumptive; it can only refer to the two kinds of sacrifice already prescribed, either at a place of a person’s own choosing or at the public altar. Both are addressed to Zeus but provide meat for entertaining an *elasteros*. So both are summed up as sacrifice “for the *elasteros*,” dative of interest, and these words are placed first.

12–13. The mode of sacrifice is “just as to the immortals”—the epic word and form denote the divine society of Olympus—and yet the blood is made to run down to earth. The contrasting styles are suited to the double nature of an *elasteros*, originating in the sky and descending to earth.

2

Displaying the Tablet

The Method

The content of the tablet is strange, however we understand the details: in column A, instructions on how to sacrifice to a series of forbidding deities, and in column B, instructions on how to purify oneself when threatened by another forbidding power. The strange content is matched by the strangeness of the physical form: a sheet of lead, not of bronze, with the two columns upside down to each other, pinioned by a solid bronze bar between them.¹ The illicit diggers who found it somewhere on the extensive site of Selinus, no doubt with a metal detector, have deprived us forever of any certain knowledge of just where it was displayed. It must have lain at the very place, or amid a load of rubbish from the very place, superseded and forgotten, after the fixture in question was dismantled or destroyed—nothing is more easily reused than a sheet of lead. If it did not suffer greatly as it lay there, its condition will be revealing. We can still come to a reasonable surmise about how it was displayed.

The dimensions are 60 cm. wide × 23 cm. high, making it much the largest lead tablet known.² It was affixed by three stout nails to a flat surface behind or beneath.³ Yet the nails were not driven through the tablet at the corners or along the edges, a usual means of affixing bronze tablets meant for public view.⁴ The edges are ragged, but not as if they have been pulled away from nails at given intervals.⁵ Instead, the bronze bar clamped the tablet in the middle, between the two columns, with nails driven through three holes at the top, middle, and bottom of the bar. This was done after the tablet was inscribed, for ruled guidelines extend beneath the bar. Again, there is a contrast with bronze tablets that were nailed in place before inscribing, so that the nail holes may be fringed by the letters. The two columns extend for nearly 30 cm. on either side of the bar, precariously free. Column A, the longer text, is also slightly wider. The upside-down arrangement of the columns was created and exhibited for its own

sake.

The tablet is almost entirely preserved. JJK entertained for a moment the possibility that the tablet was higher than now appears, and that the bronze bar extended to another symmetrical nail hole, so that column A started some twelve lines higher.⁶ K. Clinton has suggested that the bronze bar was once very much longer, with several more nail holes, and that the tablet was very much larger and gave a long list of offerings in calendar format before reaching the last of them as preserved, and starting over again in column B with rites outside the calendar format.⁷ These alternatives can be dismissed, as the first was tacitly by JJK. The size and shape of the tablet, albeit with ragged edges, and the placement of the nails in the bar show that both are nearly whole.⁸ So does the distribution of the text. Column A is filled up in twenty-four ruled lines, and the sense is complete; column B is little more than half filled, in thirteen of the ruled lines, and the sense is complete.

A fragment of a lead tablet at Corinth is inscribed in Archaic lettering with a sacrificial rule; it came to light in 1970 near the temple of Apollo.⁹ A sacrificial calendar on stone is known from two fragments found in the same area.¹⁰ Here then is a document of a similar kind, perhaps the only other instance of a public document on lead that is meant for display rather than as a record for the archives. But so far as can be seen, the format is not unusual. The only legible word, an “ox” as sacrificial victim, is inscribed retrograde as part of a boustrophedon text. There are nail holes where it was affixed to either wood or stone. So it was treated like any bronze tablet.

In what fashion was our tablet displayed and read? JJK think of the bronze bar as holding the tablet flat against another surface, and most agree. But G. Nenci and a few others maintain that the tablet was folded right back between the two columns and affixed to the opposite faces of a wooden plank, and that the plank revolved horizontally so as to present the right-hand column only to a reader standing in front of it.¹¹ It is held to be the first surviving example of a *kyrbis* or an *axôn*, such as served for Solon’s laws. Whether *kyrbis* or *axôn* could take this form may be left aside.¹² The lead shows no trace of any sharp permanent folding.¹³ The suggestion is untenable.¹⁴

Without folding, the whole tablet could be read at one time only if it lay flat upon a horizontal surface, a tabletop or the like, and a reader was able either to walk round it or to swivel it around.¹⁵ For this no parallel has been offered. The only horizontal surfaces normally inscribed are some types of sundial, which require it.¹⁶ Otherwise the Greeks read inscriptions straight ahead on a stele or a wall or a base or looked up to a crowning member. Some texts are too low or too high or too far off, requiring a reader to stoop or crane or

peer uncomfortably. Probably they were seldom read. Our tablet, however, is meant to be read and pondered; it must have been displayed near eye level.

Other suggestions are plainly inadequate. It is said that the inscriber wanted the same straight left edge for both columns, because he was given a tablet of irregular shape.¹⁷ But lead was cheap; enough of it, and the desired shape, could be provided for any public inscription.¹⁸ Maybe, it is said, the tablet was kept in some closed place and consulted by few.¹⁹ On the contrary, it is meant for general use; the ritual of column B is avowedly for anyone, and both sides prescribe very fully, down to words and gestures, also adding helpful alternatives. Or maybe it is only a “draft,” scil. a temporary publication to be replaced by a permanent one.²⁰ But a ritual text hardly requires any interim display, as if for some deliberative purpose.²¹ Moreover, the tablet was displayed for a considerable time, if the ragged edges come from wear. It has been said, but this is hardly an explanation, that the two columns might be quite different documents published together for a reason we cannot see.²² A “symbolic” interpretation has also been proposed.²³ Perhaps the opposing columns symbolize the opposing states of a person before and after he is purified by the rites of column B—he is first excluded from the community and then readmitted to it. But the purifying rites are left up to the individual, with no hint that the community is concerned. And what about the rites of column A, the greater part of the inscription?

Putting aside all these ventures, we may assume with perfect confidence that the tablet was displayed straight ahead on a vertical surface at a convenient height. But then only the right-hand column, whether this was A or B, could be read. The tablet was evidently positioned in opposite ways at different times, so that now A and now B appeared as the right-hand column. It was equally important to display one column on the right, to be read and acted upon, and to display the other column on the left and upside down. To be on the right is opportune, and to be on the left is not, and to be upside down is incapacitating. These are magical beliefs. Ancient religion is always magical in its aim of rousing or controlling nature by appealing to the right god at the right time. What is done in one column, at one season, conflicts with what is done in the other at another season. It is therefore magically undone.

Lead as the material of this inscription also points to magic. Stone and bronze, each with some advantages, are the usual materials of public inscriptions. Bronze was no doubt as common at Selinus as elsewhere in Sicily. Lead is far cheaper and goes with lesser purposes, with business transactions, tokens for temporary use, private letters,

anxious inquiries at the oracle of Dodona. Above all, it goes with private magic, the ubiquitous curses and other binding spells and the occasional protective charms.²⁴ Being so used so often, it comes to be thought of as possessing its own magic power.²⁵ That is why it is for once substituted for bronze in a public inscription.

This practice of reversing the tablet explains why it was clamped by the bronze bar instead of being solidly nailed all around. Each time it was reversed, the three nails in the bar were first drawn, and then pounded in again, without damage to the lead or the writing. Since the nails are few and strong, the fixture behind must have been a stout wooden beam. As was said, the tablet once discarded was never tampered with again, neither the lead nor the bronze being reused. The ragged edges therefore indicate that it was on display for some time. It was firmly handled by those who rearranged it periodically (twice a year, as we shall see); perhaps it was also fingered by those who stood and peered.²⁶

The magic power of right and left appears in two literary sources close in time to our tablet: Pherecydes of Athens, who probably wrote in the 460s, and Sophocles in his satyr play *Kophoi*.²⁷ Both are speaking of the mythical *Daktyloi* “Fingers,” whose name evokes our hands right and left, as does their nature, for they are handy persons as a rule. According to Pherecydes, they comprise two groups, of twenty on the right and of thirty-two on the left, practitioners respectively of magic good and bad, the former called *pharmakeis* or *ἀναλύοντες* “releasers,” the latter described as *goêtes* (FGrH 3 F 47 = schol. Apoll. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.1129).²⁸ According to Sophocles, they are two groups of five each (as if the very fingers), those on the right being male and handy, those on the left female (fr. 366 Pearson / Radt = Str. 10.22, 473, also schol. Apoll. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.1129).²⁹ If such a notion was bandied by writers at Athens, it could well be adopted by authorities at Selinus.

The Place

Selinus is among the oldest archaeological sites in Sicily, the source no doubt of many looted objects besides the inscriptions and graffiti that can be recognized. There is no denying that the finders of the tablet might have set to work anywhere on the site, either in the settlement area and the acropolis between the two streams, or in the sanctuary and cemetery areas to east and west.

JJK and others think it likely that the tablet came from the precinct of Zeus *milichios* on the *Gaggera* hill, which has indeed yielded some lead curse tablets, perhaps a great many of those reported in earlier excavations.³⁰ The curse tablets were rolled up

(one was pierced with a nail) and presumably buried in the hallowed ground that also received the ashes of sacrifice to Zeus *milichios*. Tablets elsewhere are placed in graves or thrown down wells, but are buried too in several sanctuaries of Demeter, perhaps including the adjacent sanctuary of Demeter *malophoros* at Selinus.³¹ The purpose is to reach the gods of under-earth. Our tablet was treated differently, being somehow displayed, as in the fashion argued above. Nor does it share the concern with homicide that can be imputed to Zeus *milichios*. Nor is Zeus *milichios* on *Gaggera* uniquely prominent in the tablet.

The tablet prescribes sacrifice to different gods at different times—in column A, to Zeus *milichios* in two separate districts on opposite sides of the city (as we shall see), and to Zeus *eumenês* and the *Eumenides* at a festival site, and to *Tritopatreis* at a shrine of their own. In column B the power called *elasteros* can be entreated at any site of a person's own choosing or “at the public altar.” The altar thus singled out is noteworthy, but it will not belong to any of those several sanctuaries of Zeus *milichios*, of Zeus *eumenês* and the *Eumenides*, or of the *Tritopatreis*. No reason can be thought of why one of them should be chosen for sole display of the tablet, so that the public altar is right there.

M. Rausch, regarding the tablet as a *kyrbis*, locates it in “the political center of the city,” and in “a public building” rather than a sanctuary.³² Apart from the *kyrbis* form, “the political center” is a good guess: i.e. the agora or the acropolis. Our tablet is of general interest; it was meant to be consulted by everyone. Selinus' agora has been located with growing assurance at the south foot of the hill *Manuzza*—at the approximate center of the city.³³ It will have been a tempting spot for illicit diggers in the 1970s. The acropolis is less likely to have kept this hidden treasure down to our own day, but it may have survived elsewhere in a load of rubbish. Anyway, the tablet should not be thought of as housed in a public building. It was surely displayed out of doors in good lighting. The wooden fixture behind it might be an exterior door or gateway or even a wall or fence.

Another clue has just been mentioned. In column B, after the full instructions for receiving the *elasteros* with table hospitality, a more costly sacrifice of a full-grown animal is briefly prescribed for “the public altar.” It is somehow obvious which altar this is. The *elasteros* is cognate with Zeus, since meat for the table is furnished by a sacrifice to Zeus, the victim being the cheapest possible, a piglet.³⁴ So the ensuing sacrifice that is more costly is no doubt to Zeus again. Which altar of Zeus it is does not follow from any previous indication in column B. In column A several altars of Zeus are presupposed, for sacrificing to Zeus *eumenês* and to Zeus *milichios* in two city districts,

so that none of them can be referred to without ado. What is it then, “the public altar” that is immediately obvious, if not an altar near the tablet? Either the agora or the acropolis will have an altar of Zeus. Note too that the same altar can be feasibly restored at the beginning of column A ([chapter 3](#), pp. 49–51).

An altar of Zeus *agoraios* is standard for any agora.³⁵ It does not go with any standard public building, such as a Prytaneion. His altar is bound to be accessible, since it serves as a place of refuge. At Selinus it happens to be mentioned as the unavailing refuge of the tyrant Euryleon (Hdt. 5.46.2). At Athens, where this altar is especially renowned, it was carried back in story to the days of the Heracleidae and of the mothers of the Seven slain at Thebes, and became known instead as the Altar of Pity.³⁶ Statius, certainly with some warrant from lost tragedies, describes a throng of suppliant paupers and exiles and “a frugal cult” with modest offerings (*Theb.* 12.481–509).³⁷ The only recurring worship that is attested for Zeus *agoraios* is sacrifice by magistrates to signal various occasions.³⁸ There is no festival.³⁹

Zeus is equally at home on the acropolis.⁴⁰ His altars here would not normally be so accessible and available as that of Zeus *agoraios*. The tablet however lays down its own extraordinary rules.

In short, if we are to fix on any likely setting, we shall think of the tablet as displayed beside an altar of Zeus in the agora or on the acropolis. According to the argument to be mentioned next, we shall think of this altar as accommodating rites prescribed by the tablet for opposite times of year—the sacrifice prescribed at the beginning of column A, and the sacrifice prescribed towards the end of column B.

The Times

In order to suggest when and why the tablet was displayed each way, I shall freely anticipate the results of chapters 3–15. The suggestion may therefore be treated with reserve, but is appropriate at this point.

In column A, the heading of lines 7–8 sets a deadline for all the ensuing sacrifices; it is expressed in two forms, a local festival and the Olympic truce, both marking the summer solstice of late June. The sacrifices begin in lines 8–9 with two festivals, of Zeus *eumenês* and the *Eumenides* and again of Zeus *milichios*, both assignable to the month of February. After the festivals come much fuller instructions for private sacrifice, for *Tritopatreis* in lines 9–16 and for Zeus *milichios* in lines 17–24. *Tritopatreis* are deities of Attic origin and, on the evidence of Attic calendars, are worshipped in April, as the grain ripens, and again in June, about the time of the threshing. Zeus *milichios* too is worshipped, apart from his February festival, at the time of the ingathering in June: a combination of evidence from

Athens, Megara, and Selinus links him with Demeter's harvest festival.

Before this series begins in February, another rite is prescribed in lines 1–3; it formerly occupied lines 1–6, being afterwards reduced to the simplest of offerings. It is for some reason preliminary to the rest. The detailed instructions for the series must in any case be read and pondered ahead of time, so that a choice can be made and the animal victims designated or procured.

Column A was posted ahead of the beginning of the series in February, perhaps some time ahead. A time coordinate with the deadline, the summer solstice, would be the winter solstice of late December.

In column B, the ritual is solely concerned with an *elasteros* “striker,” a lightning god. Although the time for the ritual is left open, it will be suitable for an *elasteros*. Attested rites of Zeus *kataibatês* and other lightning gods fall in August, September, October, and November; lightning is conspicuous in the sky from June to November.

Column B was posted no earlier than the summer solstice of late June, the deadline for column A; it may have been posted just then. Thus the content of the tablet requires it to be displayed each way for about half the year.

1. The strangeness has not always registered. Lazzarini (1998) speaks of “a sacred law inscribed on the two sides of a tablet of bronze”; Johnston (1999, 47–58) of “Side A” and “Side B.”

2. Cordano's term “a small leaf of lead” is hardly suitable (1996, 137).

3. JJK 3–5, 51, frontispiece, pls. 1–5. When acquired by the Getty Museum in 1981, the tablet was both glued and nailed to a modern wooden board: JJK 4n3.

4. I give a few examples out of many: Athens, Acropolis, IG i³ 510, c. 550 B.C.?, left half of a tablet c. 50 cm. wide by 11 cm. high, affixed by three nails along the top edge. Argos, IG 4.554, c. 475 B.C.?, 24 cm. wide by 8 cm. high, affixed by four nails round the edges: Brandt (1990, 507; 1992, 85, 89–90). Argos, Hypostyle Hall, fragments of many tablets, originally more than a hundred, 10–25 cm. wide by 5–10 cm. high, affixed to the poros architrave by four to six iron nails round the edges: des Courtils (1981) and Bommelaer and des Courtils (1994, 67–68).

5. The corner at the top of column A is best preserved and has no hole or gap or tear.

6. JJK 4. Such a possibility is not mentioned again.

7. Clinton (1996, 160–63). Henrichs (2005, 53) follows Clinton in supposing that column A prescribes fourth-yearly sacrifices; he does not speak of the format otherwise. Curti and van Bremen (1999, 22–24, 31–32) agree that the tablet was originally larger but reject the calendar format; so we must on other grounds as well (chapter 4, pp. 55–56). “Furthermore, we do not know whether the document was limited to a single lead sheet,” says Clinton (1996, 163). How does one display two or more tablets with upside-down columns? In a row from top to bottom or in a row from left to right?

8. “This seems to me irrefragable”: Graham (1995, 366–67).

9. H. S. Robinson, *ArchDelt* 30 (1975) [1983] B 61 = *BCH* 100 (1976) 600 =

SEG 32.359, “c. 600 B.C.” “Nail holes are preserved for mounting it on a wood or stone backer”, say Bookidis and Stroud (2004, 409). I am obliged to G. Sanders, director of the Corinth excavations, for additional details.

10. 1) IG 4.1597 = *Corinth* 8.1 no. 1 = SEG 32.358, “c. 600 B.C.”; cf. Robertson (1982, 140–42) and Lupu (2005, 65–66). 2) Robinson, *Hesperia* 45 (1976), 230–31 = SEG 26.393. “Fragments of at least 11 decrees” were also recovered in the excavation of 1970, suggesting that Apollo’s sanctuary served for the general display of public documents: so Bookidis and Stroud (2004, 409–10).

11. Nenci (1994, 460–66), Manganaro (1966, 562), Prosdocimi (1999, 470–74), Rausch (2000a, 40–41). Others treat it as a possible alternative: Brugnone (1998, 590, 593), Cusumano (1998, 781–82), Curti and van Bremen (1999, 23), and Tusa in Fama and Tusa (2000, 14).

12. Sickinger (1999, 26–31) surveys recent opinion on Athens’ *kyrbeis* and *axones*.

13. D. R. Jordan *apud* SEG 44.783.

14. Likewise Curti and van Bremen’s further suggestion of “archival storage” as the reason for folding. Lead tablets assignable to archives are in any case very much smaller and simpler.

15. JJK 4, Dubois (1995b, 127), Clinton (1996, 162), Kingsley (1996, 281), Brugnone (1998, 590). Curti and van Bremen (1999, 23) reject the notion of horizontal display.

16. Cf. Gibbs 1976.

17. JJK 3–4. Graham (1995, 366) approves, whereas Curti and van Bremen (1999, 22) do not. “It is likely that the piece of lead available for the inscribing was irregular on the two short sides,” say JJK (cf. JJK frontispiece, pl. ia). These sides are irregular or more irregular than the long sides insofar as the bottom corner of both columns (the bottom, when either is upright) is missing or reduced—that of column B is sheared straight across, and that of column A is rounded off. This is hardly the original shape; it is the effect of wear, like the gaps or breaches that are greatest on the adjacent long sides (i.e. the bottom edges of both columns).

18. Gager (1992, 3–4) explains how cheap and easy was the use of lead as a writing material. Robinson (2002, 67–69) surveys the different purposes served by lead tablets or strips.

19. The rites of column B, say JJK 5, will be performed only in case of “personal need”; the same “may be inferred for column A.” But why do such cases require the tablet to be “kept in a closed structure”?

20. JJK 5. They foresee “a more monumental inscription for public display” but then draw back: “against this, however, is the absence of any laws or decrees on stone at Selinus.” The reason why public inscriptions have mostly vanished at Selinus, as at other cities in Sicily and at e.g. Megara and Corinth in the homeland, is surely that the customary material was of bronze. According to Boffo (1996, 621), but without further explanation, “the question of the diplomatic reference / legibility / institutional meaning of a Greek inscription is far more complex than [JJK] let us think.”

21. I have argued that Nicomachus’ compilation of ritual texts, the subject of dispute at Athens, was first displayed in a preliminary form: Robertson (1990, 44–52), accepted by Hedrick (2000, 128–29). It was nonetheless an entirely different undertaking and procedure.

22. Lupu (2005, 366). Yet the examples he gives do not illustrate the point: *LSCG* 5, Athens’ first-fruits decree with Lampon’s rider; *LSAM* 12, three decrees concerning the cult of Athena *nikêphoros* at Pergamum; *LSAM* 30, two surviving rules displayed on a wall at Ephesus, for augury and for oath taking (doubtless there were many so displayed on the wall).

23. Moscatti Castelnuevo (1996, 218), Curti and van Bremen (1999, 23–24). Moscatti Castelnuevo speaks of “the symbolic character which writing can assume” and refers to Rosalind Thomas. Curti and van Bremen wonder what symbolic meaning there might be, and suggest the opposing states of one who is first polluted and then purified.
24. Curbera (1999) catalogues curse tablets in Sicily.
25. Gager (1992, 4), Graf (1997, 132–34).
26. JJK frontispiece and plate ia are views of the whole tablet showing the ragged outline. The top edge of the right-hand column, whether A or B, has survived better than the top edge of the left-hand column, whether A or B. Was the left-hand column grasped at the top by a reader as he puzzled over the right-hand column?
27. Pherecydes knows and propagates names associated with Cimon: Huxley (1973), Fowler (1999, 13; 2000, 272).
28. Fowler (2000) *ad* Pherecydes fr. 47 gives the full text of schol. Apoll. Rhod. (= 1126–31b Wendel), which is relevant here because it amplifies the acknowledged fr. 366 of Sophocles. “They say”—this is how the scholium begins —“that there are five of each [Idaeon Dactyls], the males on the right, the females on the left.” Next we hear of Pherecydes and his groups of twenty and thirty-two. Then, without ascription, we hear that they are *goêtes* and *pharmakeis* “and are said to have been the first workers of iron and miners.” And then again, “those on the left, as Pherecydes says, are the *goêtes*, and the releasers (ἀναλύοντες) are on the right.” It has been supposed that Pherecydes thought of them as both metal workers and magicians (Wendel emended ἀναλύοντες to μεταλλεύοντες, but this should be rejected). The two groups of five, however, come from Sophocles, and likewise their metal working, whereas Pherecydes spoke of them only as magicians good and bad, the former either *pharmakeis* or “releasers,” the latter *goêtes*.
29. The acknowledged fragment from Strabo says that the five males were miners and workers of iron on Phrygian Ida and that the five females were their sisters—mountain nymphs, no doubt—whence, being ten, their collective name *Daktyloi*. Apollonius’ scholiast reveals that male and female were right and left. Both Pherecydes and Sophocles are indebted in different ways to *Phoronis* fr. 2 Bernabé / 2 Davies (= schol. Apoll. Rhod. *sub fin.*), where such creatures are spoken of as both *goêtes* and ironworkers.
30. JJK ix, 7, cf. 125–31 (curse tablets), North (1996, 293), Schwabl (1996, 284), Manganaro (1997, 562), Curti and van Bremen (1999, 25). Curti and van Bremen (1999, 28–30) also associate the ritual of the *Tritopatris* with an underground installation in the *naiskos* of Zeus *milichios*, but it belongs to the Punic period, and the association is rejected in [chapter 10](#) (pp. 158–59).
31. D. R. Jordan (1998, 31) lists sanctuaries of Demeter with the respective dates of the curse tablets: Selinus, fifth century, Rhodes, ?fourth century, Mytilene, late fourth or early third century, Cnidus, ?second century, Morgantina, second century (it is probably Demeter’s), Corinth, ?second century A.D. As to Selinus, the details given by JJK 126 leave it open as to how tablets were distributed between the sanctuaries of Zeus *milichios* and Demeter. The only definite ascription to Demeter is of two tablets “found near the outer side of the retaining wall of the sanctuary of *malophoros*.”
32. Rausch (2000a, 40); he locates Solon’s *kyrbeis* in “the Prytaneion in the agora” (the old agora, he should have said). And if *kyrbeis* and *axones* are to be lumped together, the Prytaneion disputes the honors with both the Acropolis and the Stoa Basileios in the new agora. Nenci (1994, 464) and others cited in note 11 rightly doubt that a *kyrbeis* would be found on *Gaggera*.
33. Mertens (1999).
34. It will be argued that an *elasteros* is any power of lightning, a lesser power

than Zeus *elasteros*, the undoubted lightning god who is supreme.

35. For Zeus *agoraios* see Martin (1951, 174–86), Wycherley (1957, 122–23) (Athens), H. Schwabl, *RE* 10A (1972), 256–58 s. Zeus, Etienne and Knoepfler (1976, 151–55), Rosivach (1978), and Robertson (1992, 5158). Martin is fullest but strains the evidence in arguing that the worship is very ancient. See further [chapter 14](#) (pp. 222–24).

36. Robertson (1992, 51–54; 1998a, 286, 296).

37. Statius is quite familiar with two surviving plays of Euripides, *Phoenissae* and *Supplices*: see Vessey (1973, 69–70). Euripides' *Heracleidae*, the only surviving play that is relevant here, varies the usual story so as to bring the suppliants to Marathon instead of Athens. Yet it still alludes, just once, to Zeus *agoraios* (line 70), a notable tribute to the usual story. Though *Heracleidae* inspires the altar scene on South Italian vases, the detail is unreliable: the Carneia Painter gives us a column surmounted by Apollo, not Zeus. See M. Schmidt, *LIMC* 4.1 (1988), Herakleidai 2–3.

38. Martin (1951, 178–80).

39. Oaxus on Crete prescribes an enormous fine for an offending *kosmos*—a sacrifice of one hundred oxen to Zeus *agoraios* (*LSSuppl* 145, improved by van Effenterre [1985, 5–7] = *SEG* 37.743). This sacrifice however will provide a banquet for the *hetaireiai* at Apollo's festival *Pythia*. It is accordingly performed at the requisite time, perhaps round the turn of the year, and Zeus *agoraios* is only the nominal recipient. Cf. [chapter 20](#) (p. 316).

40. See Schwabl, *RE* 10A (1972) 354–55 s. Zeus (πολιεύς, also πολιάρχης and πολίωνχος).

3

A Household Offering

Synopsis

Column A, lines 1–3:

[?If someone wishes to read this over, he shall bring firstlings to Zeus.
?Take out] 'sop 'n' salt' [and make firstlings of them,] having left
[an offering upon the altar]. The persons of the household consecrate it.
[The next three lines are blank.]

The first six lines of column A are preliminary to the rest, lines 7–24, which are marked off by a separate heading. But the original six lines have been erased in favor of a shorter version of three lines, so that lines 4–6 are now blank. Admittedly, lines 1–2 are illegible except for the phrase “sop 'n' salt.” Yet the syntax is apparent throughout. There are three sentences in all, the first taking up line 1, the second line 2 and the first half of line 3, the third the second half of line 3. We see that a household makes an offering of barley meal and salt; the rest of it somehow denoted the occasion; my supplements *exempli gratia* only serve to show as much. Thus the tablet begins with a humble offering by an ordinary household. Everything else follows from this.

A General Misunderstanding

The inscribing of column A started close to the top edge of the tablet; the view that the tablet was once considerably higher is to be rejected ([chapter 2](#), p. 32). Almost nothing is left of the first line, and only half of the second remains. Line 3 is nearly complete, and we can see that lines 4–6 were wholly erased. Thereafter, in line 7, comes a new heading: *τὸν ἱεραρὸν ἡα θυσία κτλ* “the offering of the sacrifices” etc. JJK admit to their text only line 3 after a missing word or two. This first part has exercised nonetheless a powerful influence on the interpretation of the tablet.

The *homosepyoi* of line 3 are the members of a single *oikia*

“household” (Arist. *Pol.* 1.2, 1252 b 12). They are told to “consecrate” something. For *καθαίρειν* JJK have established—from the analogy of *κατακαίειν* in lines 11-12, *καταγίζοντο* in line 12, *κατακαάντο* in line 16, *κατακάαι* in lines 19-20—both the sense “consecrate” and the means of doing so, by burning up entirely.¹ Before this, persons “leave” or “have left” something. Such is the text accepted by JJK and others and accepted here, and such its undoubted meaning.

The following inferences have been drawn.² Household members take part in an animal sacrifice, as persons do throughout the rest of column A (lines 7–24). Other persons engaged in this sacrifice have left a portion of the victim on the altar to be burnt up by the household members. Perhaps then a kinship group larger than the household is in view. Throughout the rest of column A, it must be larger kinship groups that are directed to sacrifice. And Zeus *milichios* seems to belong to larger kinship groups, perhaps the *Tritopatreis* do so as well, and the *elasteros* evokes kinship groups. The whole document therefore addresses a threat to both the family and to larger kinship groups, namely homicide pollution, and this was somehow introduced in lines I-3.

But animal sacrifice cannot be assumed. The sacrifices of line 7 are those that follow and appear to be a new topic. What is burnt up and consecrated is not necessarily meat. In the three animal sacrifices that are fully described, meat alone, a “ninth part,” is burnt up in lines 11–12, but the table offerings burnt up in lines 15–16 consist of both “cakes and meat,” and we may assume as much for those of lines 19–20. Now in line 2 “sop ’n salt” is a certain reading additional to line 3 and can only be an offering.

A different group from household members cannot be assumed. There is not room in lines 1–2 to introduce such a group together with the business that will associate them with household members. “The *homosepyoi*” as subject are more likely given at the last so as to resume or clarify. It is exactly so in lines 11–12. The instruction is to “burn up”; then it is repeated as “consecrate,” with the subject added at the last as “those who have the right.”

The corresponding assumptions for the rest of the column must also be discarded. Persons are directed to sacrifice etc. in the infinitive construction, with both singular and plural subjects implied, and also by imperatives both singular and plural. No one is identified except

hois hosia

“those who have the right” in line 12. The instructions seem to be as general as those of column B, addressed to any man. Persons are to sacrifice at shrines that are certainly not their own, otherwise “at home” (lines 20–21). Nothing points to kinship groups,

unless they were formerly mentioned in lines 4–6. But if so, they were abolished by the erasure.

“Sop ‘n’ Salt”

We turn away from these assumptions to likely or possible readings. In line 3 the persons of the household burn up (“consecrate”) something that can only be the object of the participle *καταλ[η]ιπόντας* “having left” in the previous sentence. What has been left is an offering on an altar, ready to be burnt up. The missing word before the participle may well be *[ἐπίθυ]μ[α]* in the sense “an offering on the altar,” for it fits the space and the traces. The verb *ἐπιθύω* originally means “offer upon” an altar; here we have the corresponding noun.³

In line 2 the phrase *μᾶ[ζ]α[ν] τε ἅλα τε* is another accusative as object of another verb, the infinitive that we must in any case supply, since this clause is coordinate with the next one. The next clause begins *κατῆαιγίζεν δέ*, with the object understood. This one began [infinitive] *δέ*, with the object following straightway. *μᾶζα* “barley meal” in usual parlance is only a lump of it—moistened, kneaded, shaped, and dried, to be moistened again and eaten without cooking.⁴ Taken with salt it is the simplest fare. My rendering “sop ‘n’ salt” is meant not only to convey this but also to indicate a stock phrase—which justifies the reading.

Though JJK made out the surviving letters and suggested the inevitable reading, they did not admit it to the text because (they said) the tablet does not otherwise employ the connective *τε*.⁵ Double *τε . . . τε*, the only common use, is in question. It would indeed serve as well as *καί* within the series of nouns in lines 14–15 and in line 19. If “sop ‘n’ salt” make a ready pair, so do “table and couch” in line 14, and so do “cakes and meat” in line 15. On this showing *τε . . . τε* was not simply a colloquial idiom interchangeable with *καί*. Something more has dictated the expression.

Now in column B line 13 the word and form *ἀθανάτοισι* is another peculiar choice, doubly so because in column A line 17 *θεοῖς* is employed in the same phrase “just as to the gods.” The ending *-οισι* obtrudes as much as the word itself. Just this word and just this dative ending evoke scenes of sacrifice in Homer, sacrifice to gods far above us. It was borrowed to express such a meaning, for the next sentence gives a contrasting destination, “down to earth.” The phrase *μᾶζαν τε ἅλα τε* is borrowed too—not from poetry but from customary speech in which *τε . . . τε* has a special function.

Of the pair “sop ‘n’ salt” the one is the plainest of foods, and the other is the universal seasoning. It is seasoning alone that makes food palatable. The first member is transformed by the second; the pair thus joined constitutes an aphorism. Homer has examples that must have been current outside of poetry. The pair *ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε* “little but loved” lends itself to strikingly different cases (*Il.* 1.167, *Od.*

6.208, 14.58).⁶ The pair *ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε* “increases but also reduces,” of Zeus’ granting strength in battle but also refusing it, is a caution or a consolation that is often developed at length but only once expressed with epigrammatic brevity (*Il.* 20.242).⁷ The petitions of hymns make use of arresting pairs to captivate the deity: “grant *ἀρετήν τ’ ἀφενός τε* goodness but also prosperity,” “keep this city *ἐν θ’ ὁμονοίαι / ἐν τ’ εὐηπείαι* “in harmony but also in prosperity” (*Callim. H. Jov.* 94, *H. Cer.* 134–35).⁸ Such aphoristic expressions disappear in discursive prose.

As a stock phrase “sop ‘n’ salt” was probably inherited by Selinus from Megara. In Aristophanes’ *Acharnians* the Megarian’s parting wish for his daughters is that they may at least eat their barley sop with salt: *ἐφ’ ἀλὶ τὰν μᾶδδαν* (line 835).⁹ The joke is partly that salt as a Megarian export already mentioned will henceforth be admitted to Athens. But since the famished Megarians at their very first appearance make straight for barley sop in the market, *ποττὰν μᾶδδαν* (line 732), it is likely that the two staples had a traditional association at Megara that continued at Selinus.

Such are the readings to be supplied in lines 2–3: *μᾶ[ζ]α[ν] τε χάλα τε* a near certainty, *[ἐπίθ]μ[α]* an attractive possibility. They are enough to illustrate the construction throughout. The clause ending with the participle in line 3 is an infinitive clause and began in line 2 with a single word before *δέ*, which can only be an infinitive. Both this clause and the next point to the household and its basic stores. In each household barley sop is kept in a grain bin called *σιπύη/σεπύα*, whence the term *χομοσέπυοι* (this term and *σιπύη* are discussed below). Salt is kept in a tub called *ἀλία*.¹⁰ The persons who operate with barley sop and salt are perhaps told to “*[ἐξελεῖν]* take out” the two staples. Whatever verb it was—however “sop ‘n’ salt” were introduced—they are beyond a doubt the offering burnt up by household members in line 3. There is no room for something else to be mentioned and separate uses to be indicated.

The line is readily completed as *{κα}κάπ[ἀρχεσθαι τότον]* “and to offer firstlings of these,” barley sop and salt. The two letters

κα are plainly repeated, and it must be by mistake. The next letter π is all but certain and points to the same verb as in lines 15–16. There and again in lines 19–20, firstlings are taken from table offerings as the portion to be burnt up.

Lines 2–3 are therefore concerned with firstlings to be offered by a given household.

[ἐξελέν] δὲ μᾶ[ζ]α[ν] τε ἡάλα τε {κα} καπ[άρχεσθαι τότον]
[ἐπίθυ]μ[α] καταλ[ή]ιπόντας. κατῆαιγίζεν δὲ τὸς ἡομοσεπύος.

having left [an offering upon the altar]. The persons of the household consecrate it.

As *μᾶζα* “barley sop” is the most basic food, so it is the most basic offering. Offerings of grain, though manifold, are classified according to the form they take, baked or not, and according to the way they are offered, set out as on a table or burnt up, and both classifications appear to coincide with the general terms *popanon* and *pelanos*.¹¹ The *pelanos* is uncooked wheat or barley meal and is burnt up.¹² It is a simple offering, suited to the household.¹³ At Athens it was instituted by Cecrops (Paus. 8.2.3), who also first established marriage and the family. It was man’s original pure-hearted offering to the gods before any animal victim was thought of (Theophr. *De Piet.* fr. 2 Potscher).

An offering of barley and salt together is not otherwise Δύεσted in Greek ritual, but at Rome the Vestal Virgins prepare *mola salsa* as a characteristic offering.¹⁴ So-called *mola* is parched and pounded spelt,

a basic household store that is the Roman equivalent of *μᾶζα*, just as *far* “spelt” is the Roman equivalent of *κριθή* “barley” (Anglo-Saxon *bere* is cognate in form with Latin and in sense with Greek). After the harvest, on alternate days in the second week of May, the three senior Vestals bring in baskets of spelt and then parch and pound a store of *mola* for the coming year (Serv. auct. *Ecl.* 8.82). The Vestals also keep cakes of salt in a jar, after these too are produced by pounding and baking (Fest. *muries* p. 152 Lindsay, citing Veranius). Three times a year, on June 9, September 13, and February 15, they make up *mola salsa* by adding the salt to the spelt (Serv. *loc. cit.*).

As all agree, the Vestals with their houselike shrine and their domestic routine perpetuate the household customs of early days. The *mola salsa* was once a household offering. The three dates on which it is prepared are turning points in the agrarian calendar. June 9 marks the harvest; September 13, the first plowing and sowing; and February 13, the beginning of the anxious Lenten season, when the crop is due

to ripen. This last date will also be close in time to our preliminary offering in column A: the sacrificial series that follows begins with two festivals of mid- and late February (chapters 6–9). It too may be a vestige of unrecorded ancient custom.

These firstlings are followed by the more substantial offerings of column A, which lead up to the harvest and celebrate the harvest season. (Here and elsewhere I say “firstlings” instead of the usual “first fruits” because the latter term, which comes from the Bible, suggests a vegetable component that is incidental to *(ἀπ)άρχομαι* and *(ἀπ)αρχή* in Greek.) “Sop ‘n’ salt,” though offered long before the harvest, may also be reckoned firstlings of the new crop. Firstlings in the auspicious sense were offered at the outset, as the grain was sown, and throughout the period of growth.¹⁵ But it is only a shrewd possibility. It would be so to those who pondered the tablet at Selinus.

Households and Grain Bins

The rare word *ὁμοσέπνοι* is an official term to describe any household. It means “sharers in the grain bin” and accordingly the members of a single household, a family. Since Aristotle contrasts the family so called with larger kinship groups, JJK and others are led to the notion of a common threat to both family and larger kinship groups, which can only be homicide pollution. The word directs us rather to country life and agrarian religion. Before the tablet came to light, the context in Aristotle was somewhat misleading.

Aristotle cites the word at the beginning of the *Politics* to make a fundamental point, the utilitarian nature of all human association (1.2, 1252 b 12). Society originates, he says, with the *oikia* “family” as the smallest association serving a practical purpose. For proof he points to the words for “family” allegedly used by Charondas (of Catane) and Epimenides of Crete, *ὁμοσίπνοι* and *ὁμόκαποι*.¹⁶ It is as if the purpose of a family is to share the food stored in a

σιπήνη or a *κάπη*. From the family Aristotle proceeds to larger associations, *kōmai* “villages,” which he somewhat dubiously represents as larger kinship groups, extensions of the family, now holding up the term *ὁμογάλακτες*, expressive in a different way.¹⁷ The only other occurrence of the word, Hesychius’ gloss

ὁμοσίπνοι· ὁμοτράπεζοι, takes us no further, as the definition is a general term for “messmates” and so a mere tautology.¹⁸ Most likely, Hesychius is glossing Aristotle. There may have been no other instance of the word in literature, and certainly there was none so prominent as the beginning of the *Politics*.

Despite Aristotle, it is unlikely that *homosipyoi* and *homokapoi* were in use anywhere as ordinary words for family members. To make his point, he should simply have cited the grain bin, which everywhere typifies the individual household and its variable resource. In literature, chiefly Διῖc comedy and later bellelettrists, it is always *σιτύη*.¹⁹ *κάπη* < *κάπτω* must have been the same on Crete, though we know the word only from epic and later poetry and only as a crib for domestic animals.²⁰ By contrast with these words for grain bin, the terms *homosipyoi* and *homokapoi* are suited only to documentary language, the latter to documents from Crete. Aristotle may have drawn directly on such documents. The text of the *Politics* may be interpolated, here at the beginning, with two imposing source names. There are several reasons to think so.

For the ensuing term *homogalaktes*, which is equally important, Aristotle cites no authority. It was undoubtedly known to him from documents.²¹ For technical terms elsewhere in the *Politics* he cites no authority.²² It is surprising to find the lawgiver Charondas and the seer Epimenides named together, doubly surprising to meet them as the respective sources of matching technical terms. Charondas' laws are unrepresented by any other verbal quotation and do not otherwise concern the family.²³ Aristotle's very notable interest in Cretan law does not elsewhere lead him to Epimenides, and indeed the works of Epimenides do not, so far as known, extend to Cretan law.²⁴ Furthermore, Epimenides is duly called "the Cretan," but Charondas is not called "the Catanaean," as would be natural for Aristotle at first mention—he is so called at *Pol.* 2.12, 1274 a 23, which is otherwise the first mention! If however Aristotle were to cite the terms *homosipyoi* and *homokapoi* without sources, he would describe the latter as Cretan, whereas the former was general. As was said, Hesychius' entry *homosipyoi* is probably due to this passage and if so does not Διῖest any other literary instance. The suspicion is very strong that Aristotle's argument has been padded with two stock names, Epimenides and Charondas, which seemed both suitable and impressive.

In any case, *homosipyoi* and *homokapoi* will ultimately come from documents that adopted these terms to suit the business at hand: agrarian ritual, as at Selinus. The household and its grain bin are prominent in ritual at the harvest, and before it, and just after.

Athens' festival *Diasia*, addressed to Zeus *milichios*, is a great gathering of households in late *Anthestêrion* = February, at the beginning of the Lenten season, as we may call the time of year when stores are running low and the next crop is still uncertain.²⁵ The characteristic offering is of cakes shaped like sacrificial animals, and the atmosphere is a combination of levity and gloom. The depleted

grain bin is painfully taxed in hope of a large return.

In the Tetrapolis of Marathon, at the deme Hecale, households gather after the harvest to celebrate a festival of Zeus *hekaleios*. It is a day in early *Hekatombaiôn* = July, as we see from Plutarch's *Life of Theseus*.²⁶ The offering is apposite. In the festival aetiology the old woman "Hecale," eponym of the cult site, entertains Theseus in her own small house, and the entertainment consists above all in country-style loaves baked in the ashes, which she brings forth from the

σπίθη—Callimachus uses the very word (*Hecale* fr. 251 Pfeiffer / 35 Hollis). Each household, we may infer, made such an offering.²⁷

The harvest itself is marked by a festival of Demeter, often called *Thalysia*.²⁸ In Theocritus' *Thalysia*—an ancient title, whether it was conferred by Theocritus or not—a wealthy family celebrate the festival at home on their farm, at the threshing floor and a nearby altar (Id. 7.31–34, 155–57).

In short, households and grain bins are prominent in agrarian ritual. It is accidental that the words *homosipyoî* and *sipyê* do not appear elsewhere in such epigraphic regulations as survive.

What Was Said in the First Line?

The first line is lost except for the slightest traces. It was a sentence or a phrase complete in itself. It served to introduce the business of the two infinitive clauses in lines 2–3 since the first of them has no expressed subject. It was therefore a heading. It needs to be discussed in the light of the overall arrangement of the tablet. As to the rest of column A, let us for a moment assume what will be argued hereafter.

In lines 7–8 a new heading—it is not a sentence fragment, as JJK maintain—introduces a series of sacrifices to be performed before the summer solstice, as marked by public observances. They follow in chronological order, beginning with two festivals of early spring, to be equated with the *Eumenideia* and the *Diasia* Διῆστέδ elsewhere. The others are no part of public festivals at stated times, but are assigned to several public shrines, until in lines 20–21 a sacrifice at home is allowed as an economical alternative. The sacrifices then are all for an individual to perform as he chooses, and each is explained at length, like the ritual of lines 2–3, except for those at the two festivals, where the sacrificial mode will be obvious.

The ritual of lines 1–3 (or the previous version which occupied lines 1–6) is preliminary to the long series of sacrifices between early spring and the solstice. Whereas those sacrifices take place as the crop matures and as it is harvested, a time of protracted anxiety, this one is an offering of firstlings of grain taken from the household stores. It is generally suitable, but not for any of the rather threatening deities

addressed hereafter (the last of them, Zeus *milichios* on the hill *Gaggera*, is adjacent to the goddess of the harvest, Demeter *malophoros*, but she does not appear in the tablet). Nor is there room in the heading for mention of any of these shrines. For some reason it is obvious which shrine or altar is in question.

The purifying rites in column B, which is upside down while column A is in view, are for a different time of year. After the principal rite of table hospitality, sacrifice may also be offered “on the public altar.” This we understand to be an altar of Zeus, since a sacrifice to Zeus is prescribed as part of the table hospitality, and Zeus is cognate with the polluting power called *elasteros*, having elsewhere the like epithet. But no shrine of Zeus, no particular place at all, is ever mentioned in column B. As part of the table hospitality the sacrifice may be conducted anywhere, at no regular altar. And yet it is obvious thereafter which public altar of Zeus is meant. As was said in [chapter 2](#) (pp. 36–38), the tablet was no doubt displayed in some public area. The agora is a likely choice, with its altar of Zeus *agoraios*. The acropolis is another possibility if it gave ready access to an altar of Zeus. The same altar of Zeus, in the agora or on the acropolis, will be in view at the beginning of column A.

Lines 2–3 prescribe the simplest of offerings, “sop ‘n’ salt.” The heading indicated when or why the offering is made and where. The heading in the other column begins with a condition taking up more than a whole line, *[αἴ] κ’ ἄνθρωπ[ο]ς . . . [λ < ε] ι* “if a person wishes to” etc. The long apodosis that follows gives detailed instructions. Thereafter an alternative procedure is introduced by another condition of a line and a half, *αἴ τις κα λῆι* “if someone wishes to” etc. Our heading may well have taken the same form, but condition and apodosis were complete in one line, since *δέ* in line 2 introduces a new clause.

“If someone wishes to—*ἄ*” Perhaps it is to “read over” this right-hand column of the tablet, newly displayed each year for general use:

[αἴ τις κα λῆι] ἀν[νέμω]. ἀννέμω = ἀνανέμω is used of a determined act of reading, “read over” (“con over,” *LSJ*). It is very suitable to both the context and the traces; the Doric form especially is commended by certain parallels. An indecorous graffito on a black-glaze kylix from Montagna di Marzo (Erbessus?), c. 500–480 B.c.,

mocks *τὸν ἀννέμοντα* “the one who reads this over” (*SEG* 35.1009 / *IGDS* 167).²⁹ Theocritus in his evocation of Helen as a tree goddess speaks of a supposed inscription in the bark, a summons to worship, *ὥς παριὼν τις / ἀννείμη Δωριστί* “so that a passerby may read over in Doric,” etc. (*Id.* 18.48).³⁰ For the rest, poets use the word in ways variously suggestive.³¹

The apodosis will say he is to make a certain offering at a certain place. Perhaps ἀ[παρχὴν ἐπιφέρει τοῖ Δί or τοῖ βομῶι] “he is to bring firstlings to Zeus” or “to the altar.” There is not room to identify the place where the god is worshipped or where the altar stands, if it is not obvious. It is obvious with “the public altar” of the other column; it will be obvious here too.

So much *exempli gratia*. All that matters is to see that the business of line 1 must go with the business of lines 2–3 and that *they* are quite intelligible. We should also remember that lines 1–3 replace a longer version of six lines. The simpler version may have been intended to make the ritual of the tablet even more generally available than it was before.

1. JJK 18–20; cf. 63–64, 66.

2. JJK 50–52, 61, 66, 114. Thereafter, on the first three lines, Dubois (1995a, 557; 1995b, 130–31), Clinton (1996, 163), North (1996, 295, 298), Arena (1997, 432; 1998, 17), Brugnone (1998, 593–95), and Rausch (2000a, 44–48).

3. Apollo directs his priests “construct an altar... kindling fire upon it and offering white barley meal upon it,” ἐπί τ’ ἄλφιστα λευκὰ θύοντες (*H. Apoll.* 490–91), almost the same offering as here. Casabona (1966, 98) remarks and explains this original meaning, together with a secondary meaning “offer in addition.” For our purpose, *LSJ* and *LSJ Rev. Suppl.* *s. ἐπιθύω, ἐπίθυμα* and *LfggrE s. θύω* are not so helpful.

4. The preparation and use of μᾶζα are described by Pearson on *Soph. fr.* 563. The usual rendering is “barley cake,” but I avoid it because it might suggest cooking.

5. JJK 8, 18.

6. The aphorism is employed at critical moments by Achilles, Nausicaa, and Eumaeus. Achilles employs it pathetically, of his own small share of the spoils. Nausicaa employs it ironically, of her token kindness to a beggar. Eumaeus employs it piously, of his charity—“little but loving”—towards one even lower than himself.

7. Thus Aeneas to Achilles. Elsewhere, Hector says about the same in four lines, in the latter two that Zeus sometimes μινύθει “reduces” the strength of one side (*Il.* 15.490–93).

8. Arresting pairs they surely are. In *H. Jov.* the next two lines explain that prosperity needs goodness as well, and goodness needs prosperity, after which the petition is repeated. In *H. Cer.* the next two and a half lines expatiate first on prosperity and then on “peace.”

9. The verb used is παίειν, with whatever effect—the general sense is clear (cf. S. D. Olson on lines 834–35, Oxford 2002).

10. For ἀλία see Gow and Page on Callim. *HE* 28 = *A.P.* 6.301, the dedication of such a tub to the Samothracian gods after it helped its owner to weather life’s storms. The poem was brought to notice by Bentley when he showed that the tub was not a ship (*A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris*, preface lix–lx).

11. Stengel (1910, 67–68). In the early Hellenistic period Athenian officials are

praised for offering *popana* and *pelanoi* to all the gods and heroes. SEG 44.42, decree of Collytus, 327/26–318 b.c., line 27, *lege*

πόπανα καὶ πελανοῦς (*πελανὸν* Walbank). SEG 43.28 = 46.158, decree of Rhamnus, 262/61 b.c., line 9, *πελανοῦς καὶ πόπανα ὅπως ἐ*]-/χει καλῶς κτλ.

12. Ziehen, RE 19.1 (1937): 247–48 *S. πελανός* further constructs an evolutionary scheme in which man advances from throwing whole grains on the earth or in the fire to rough grinding and soaking them and finally to milling and cooking and virtual porridge.

13. A *pelanos*, said Apollonius of Acharnae in his work *On Attic Festivals*, is “formed from grain taken from the *halos* threshing-floor” (FGrH 365 F 1; cf. Hsch. s. *πνα*). According to Tresp (1914, 98), he refers to the Eleusinian festival *Haloa* (and also draws on Philochorus FGrH 328 F 83). Jacoby (*ad loc.*) repeats the first conjecture, while observing rightly that the *pelanos* is not confined to one festival. Taking grain from the *halos* can have nothing to do with the *Haloa*. This festival of midwinter received its untypical name from some use of threshing floors that was just as untypical, perhaps for the construction of bonfires. Apollonius merely states the obvious, perhaps addressing one who has seen only grain at market. The substance of his other fragments is either painfully obvious (F 2–3, 5) or blatantly false (F 4, 5 again). He is not the *exêgêtês* of the *Eumolpidai* named in IG 2² 3487, as Jacoby thought (= T I). A fragment unpublished then indicates a different demotic: Clinton (1974, 92n20).

14. Holland (1961, 316–25) examines the preparation of *mola salsa* while connecting it, improbably, with the ritual of the *Argei*.

15. See Robertson (1996d) apropos of the festival *Proêrosia*. At SEG 50.43 and 169 it is implied that such a meaning is unnatural and implausible. On the contrary, it is the very purpose of the festival, registered in documents and trumpeted by legend. If extended discussion seems inherently “speculative” or simply tedious, I have cited the plainest evidence at the outset (1996d, 320–25).

16. JJK 20 rightly insist that *homosipyoi* refers to a household, as opposed to F. Bourriot’s notion of a local group. As to *ὀμοκάπους*, the variant

ὀμοκάπνους is quite inferior, though adopted by Diels-Kranz in *Vorsokr* 3 B 3 and entertained by Jacoby in FGrH 457 F 20 and by Fowler in his Epimenides fr. 19. “Sharers in the smoke” was substituted for the unfamiliar term. Aristotle’s argument is painstaking, and he would not expect us to indulge him by equating “smoke” with “hearth” and then “hearth” with “food.” JJK 20 err in speaking of a “garden,” which is not immediately distinctive of a family and implies a Doric form inadmissible for Aristotle, *-κάπους* for *-κήπους*.

17. A village is thought of as a colony of related families all descended from the founder. Cf. note 2I.

18. The definition is plainly improvised. Inspiration, if it was needed, was provided by passages like Ar. Eq. 1298–99, where *sipyê* and *trapeza* have the same significance in successive lines.

19. See especially Leon. HE 36, 37 = AP 6.300, 302; Alciph. 2.11. Actual bins from wealthy households are listed on the Attic stelae (IG 1³ 422.2, 6, 17, 425.16). Likely shapes are indicated by Sparkes (1962, 124) and Amyx (1958, 195–97). The diminutive *σπιίς* denotes a *pyxis*, being written on one from central Sicily: IGDS 170, cf. Dubois (1995b, 130).

20. IL 8.434, etc. It is certainly not the case that *ὀμόκαποι* is “a metaphor with pastoral vocabulary” used by Epimenides *qua* poet, as affirmed by Dubois

(1995b, 131), who more strangely still compares ephebic nomenclature at Sparta.

21. The word famously appears in a clause quoted from a document whose nature is disputed, requiring phratries, or one of them, to admit both *orgeônes* and *homogalaktes* (Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 35a). Lambert (1993, 60–61) suggests how *homogalaktes* as related families might be concerned in a rule for phratries.

22. The Cretan terms *andreia* and *kosmoi* are introduced without ado (*Pol.* 2.10, 1272 a 3, 6), even though the former is said to bear on the history of Crete and Sparta. Likewise the terms for secret informants at Syracuse, *potagôgides* and *ôtakoustai* (5.11, 1313 b 13).

23. More optimistically, our passage “suggests that he wrote at least one law concerning family affairs”: so Gagarin (1986, 67n70), apropos of early “family law” as reported by Aristotle and others. It is generally agreed that the laws or decencies ascribed to Charondas at the foundation of Thurii (Diod. 12.II.3–19.2) contain no authentic material (Gagarin 1986, 62).

24. See Jacoby, *FGrH* III b I.323, 330, 2.200, who observes that a work on Cretan law cannot be entertained, as it was by Diels-Kranz, after Eduard Meyer. Jacoby thinks rather of the *Cretica*, which on the evidence of *FGrH* 457 F 18–19 ^{was} a mythographic work dealing with the birth of Zeus and the fate of Ariadne, and is dated by Jacoby as early as the fourth century only on the strength of Aristotle’s citation here; so too Fowler (2000, 79), even preferring *saec. iv ineunte*. According to West (1983, 52), the *Cretica* “might be the same as [Epimenides’] theogony,” which he assigns to an Athenian milieu in the first years of the Peloponnesian War.

25. Zeus *milichios* is fully treated in chapters 8–9 and 12–13. As to the households and cakes, see e.g. Ar. *Nub.* 408–9, 864, and Thuc. 1.126.6 with Jameson (1965, 165–66).

26. The occasion is dated by its place in the life of Theseus: just after he arrived in Athens, i.e. in early summer. As we see from Plutarch, every action of his youth was tied to some calendar observance by the Attic chroniclers, and though their emulous variations can be slightly contradictory, the general outline is firm. He arrived on 8 *Hekatombaiôn* (*Thes.* 12.2). And he fell in with Hecale while pursuing the Marathonian bull so as to offer it to Apollo *delphinios* in Athens (*Thes.* 14.1). In the original conception this was part of the Apolline festival of 7 *Hekatombaiôn*, which gives the month name and figures in the story of Theseus’ arrival in several ways, as when he tosses a pair of oxen over the temple roof in an exaggeration of ephebic prowess (Paus. 1.19.1).

27. This gathering of households seems to be passed over in the calendar of the Tetrapolis (IG 2² 1358 / Lambert [2000a, 45–47]), even though Kukunari, where the stone was found, may well be the deme Hecale. Note however that in early *Hekatombaiôn* on a day that is lost a goat is offered to [Apollo *ap*]otropaïos (A 2426), probably with reference to the Apolline festival (above n26). Lambert (2000a, 52, 54, 69; 2000b, 71–75) finds [Apollo *apo*]tropaïos in another calendar plausibly ascribed to Marathon, IG 1³ 255.10–11, but in a rite of midwinter on the promontory Cynosura. A more likely candidate is [Poseidon *pros*]tropaïos, worshipped elsewhere at just this time with this epithet and a like-named festival (which gives the month name *Poitropios*).

28. The Boeotian month *Θειλούθιος* = *Skirophoriôn* comes from the Aeolic form *θειλούθια*. In Athens and the Attic demes, the last in the series of Demeter’s festivals—each pertaining to a stage of the grain cycle—is the *Skira*, named for the new crop after the threshing made it “white.” Athens’ civic festival *Skirophoria* and Megara’s *Malophoria* are named for processions signalized by carrying of the grain, probably as offerings. We come to these festivals of Megara and Athens in [chapter 13](#).

29. Epicharmus fr. 232 K-A doubtless used this Doric form, as editors remark.

30. An actual epitaph from Eretria, c. 450?, summons the passerby Selpo

δεῦρο ἰὸν ἀνάεμαι (CEG 1.108).

31. The literary occurrences of mostly Attic forms and their nuances of meaning are discussed by Pearson on Soph. fr. 143 and by Gow on Theocr. *Id.* 18.48.

The *Kotyia* and the Olympic Truce

Synopsis

Column A, lines 7–8:

The offering of the sacrifices before the *Kotyia* and before the truce every fourth year in which the Olympiad comes round.

This noun phrase is a heading that looks forward to all the ritual of column A. The ritual is to be performed before the merry festival *Kotyia* for which Selinus is renowned, and in Olympic years before the season of the Olympic truce, which may at times begin before the local festival, since it follows a different time scheme. Festival and truce come round in midsummer; such is the terminus for the ritual. But the ritual by its very nature will be performed before the festival and the truce, for it is concerned entirely with the needs and the hopes of the critical growing season from early spring to early summer. The terminus is mentioned not as an admonition but as a promise. In either form, *Kotyia* or truce, it marks the midsummer celebration that is the only sure reward for inexorable toil. In either form, it appeals to everyman. Under the name *Kronia*, it inspires the notion of the Golden Age; at Olympia, it marks the beginning of the Panhellenic truce leading up to the strenuous festival of Zeus in late summer. The *Kotyia* are a Dorian version of the *Kronia*, without any famous myth but with a ribald reputation of its own.

Disputed Meanings

The syntax of these words has been called into question. They follow the erasure of lines 4–6, apparently a separate clause without a verb (τῶν ἡπαρῶν ἡ θυσία is literally “the sacrificing of the victims” rather than “the offering of the sacrifices”). According to JJK, there are three possible lines of interpretation.¹ It may be that the words as we have them are a heading complete in itself, “referring to all the relevant

sacrifices for the current year,” and implying also “that they had been mentioned earlier.” Or it may be that part of the syntax has been lost in the erasure, including a verb but perhaps other words as well, which brings us to suppose that the first four words are not a single phrase, and that *τὸν ἱαρόν*, perhaps somehow qualified—perhaps as “purificatory”—belongs to previous business. Or it may be yet again that, with part lost, *τὸν ἱαρόν* means something quite different, such as “shrines” or “sacred objects.” This last interpretation is preferred by JJK, but by no one else.

Now given the usual verb phrase *τὰ ἱερὰ θύειν*, the first four words are naturally taken as the corresponding noun phrase. The phrase implies no backward reference, no more than *ἡ θυσία* by itself would do. The verb phrase is nearly always *τὰ ἱερὰ θύειν*, not *ἱερὰ* or *ἱερὸν θύειν*, because the meaning of the verb *θύειν* is complete without the object unless particular sacrifices are in view.²

Here *τὸν ἱαρόν* points to the particular sacrifices that follow. It is not plausible to break up the noun phrase and say that the first half of it could belong to some different construction, lost in the erasure. It is

not plausible to say that *τὰ ἱαρά* could be either “shrines” or “sacred objects.” To be sure, the word means “sacred objects” in line 18 and again in line 22, according to a likely restoration. It means “organs” *qua* omens in line 24, according to another likely restoration.

But all the rest of column A calls for *θύειν*, *θύοντο* repeatedly, with offerings in the accusative, which can only be subsumed as *τὰ ἱαρά*. Above all, it is not plausible to say that the erasure may have mangled the sense at this crucial point.³ The rest of the inscription, before it suffered damage, was fully intelligible.

It is then a complete heading and means in effect “the (following) sacrifices are to be offered before the *Kotytiā* and the truce.”⁴ The deities receiving sacrifice are elsewhere known to do so, as we shall see in chapters 6–13, over a period of several months down to the seasonal terminus here announced. It is conceivable that lines 4–6 formerly introduced the topic by saying for example “if a person wishes to offer sacrifice before or during the harvest, he is to do so as here prescribed,” so that the terminus was mentioned next. “The sacrifices” would refer back as well as point forward. But if lines 4–6 merely introduced the topic, it is strange that they were erased. More likely, lines 1–6 formerly prescribed a different preliminary offering. A different offering might be erased for various reasons. Perhaps it was a larger one that proved too restrictive; the offering we have, sop ‘n’ salt, represents the utmost economy. If so, the series of sacrifices were always mentioned as a new topic, together with the terminus.

A local festival, the *Kotyia*, is the terminus year by year. In an Olympic year there is another terminus, the beginning of the truce. The truce, we must suppose, supersedes the *Kotyia* as a terminus either *because* it comes earlier or *if* it comes earlier.⁵ It need not always come earlier. Festival and truce are determined by different time schemes, so that there can be no exact constant relationship between them.⁶

The *Kotyia* will fall on a given day in Selinus' calendar of months, and Selinus will have used, perhaps with some change, the calendar of Megara.⁷ The monthly sequence begins in winter, with observation, however imperfect or neglected, of the winter solstice. But thereafter the months run on by themselves up to the summer date of the *Kotyia*. The calendar of Elis likewise begins at the winter solstice, but the Olympic Games, and hence the truce, are fixed by summer moons, not by the calendar, so that the games fall in two successive calendar months in two successive Olympiads.⁸ The *Kotyia* and the beginning of the Olympic truce are dates that will differ markedly from time to time. But in their different time schemes they are somehow equivalent.

Another view entirely should be mentioned. It is thought that the sacrifices of column A are for an Olympic year only.⁹ The *Kotyia* will provide the terminus in an Olympic year if it comes earlier, or else the local festival will serve as a reminder if the announcement of the truce is delayed. This is certainly not the natural meaning, as claimed.¹⁰ On the contrary, it goes dead against the word order, local festival and Olympic truce. Such a meaning could no doubt be understood within a certain context—if these sacrifices were the last in a long series, if they were preceded by sacrifices to be offered every year, listed in calendar order, and by others to be offered every second year, listed in calendar order, and finally by those to be offered every fourth year.¹¹ But the tablet is nearly whole and cannot be thus reconstructed.¹²

It may also be asked whether the *Kotyia* and the truce are indeed a terminus or are somehow the object of the sacrifices that precede them. To suggest that the community is thus prepared for the Olympic Games is conformable only with the view we have just rejected, that column A prescribes for an Olympic year.¹³ A similar suggestion is that both the *Kotyia* and the truce are public events of the first importance that require a condition of general purity.¹⁴ Yet these two occasions could not possibly be exalted above all others, especially above others at the harvest season, when according to general custom the community makes itself fit for the new crop. And the festival *Kotyia*, as we shall soon see, is a time of merry license, far from thoughts of purity. Or again, since the sacrifices are thought of as appeasing grim deities concerned with pollution, the festival is

regarded as a “renewal” that can come only when the pollution is removed.¹⁵ This too is implausible. It necessarily implies that the Olympic truce has the same significance. And it is the truce, not the games themselves. On the usual outlook, the beginning of the truce is not itself a festival occasion. How the *Kotytia* and the truce can be interchangeable, and why they are all-important, are questions puzzling and unexplained.

We shall see that the sacrifices and the deities have to do with the last stages of the agricultural year, Lent and harvest, anxious and arduous respectively. The end of it and the beginning of the summer lull will be greeted with relief. The festival *Kotytia* brings relief, utter relief, with irresponsible topsy-turvy merriment. Though assigned to a certain day in the calendar of Selinus, it belongs to a class of Greek festivals that signalize the moment when nature turns around, the summer solstice. So does the beginning of the Olympic truce; it originates with the leading instance of this class, the festival *Kronia*. The *Kotytia* and the truce are corresponding observances, local and Panhellenic. Let us consider first the *Kotytia*, then the truce.

The Alleged *Kotytia* of Thrace and Athens

The festival *Kotytia* is chiefly known from antiquarian comment that gives a jumble of strange details. How or whether they all cohere has been much debated.¹⁶ The mention in our tablet adds nothing, except to indicate the general significance of the festival as a turning point in summer. It should encourage us, however, to deal more firmly with the antiquarian comment. Though Athens and Thrace are much spoken of, it is clear that the festival and its eponymous goddess, *Kotytô*, were typically Sicilian and Dorian. The mischievous snatching that is a leading element of the ritual is located at Selinus in particular. Corinth too has the goddess and hence the festival, and as the mother city of Syracuse will account for some of the Sicilian custom.

Athens and Thrace should be subtracted from the record. Athens comes into it, as we shall see in a moment, only because Eupolis in his play *Baptae* represented Alcibiades as engaged in the merry and lascivious festival customs, which they however—Eupolis and Alcibiades—doubtless knew from Corinth and even more from Sicily, since the Sicilian expedition was then in prospect. Thrace, which has a reputation anyway for propagating orgiastic rites, was identified by C. A. Lobeck as the homeland of *Kotytô*, and this moral doctrine has been almost unquestioned ever since.¹⁷ The Thracian name *Kotys*, used also in Greece, is too similar and too celebrated to elude conjecture.¹⁸ Together with much else from Thrace and Phrygia, it was held up in

Strabo's elaborate disquisition on the Curetes and orgiastic rites (10.3.16, 470, citing Aesch. fr. 57 Radt/ 71 Mette).¹⁹ But there it is not equated with *Kotyô*, apart from inferior readings and wishful emendations. It cannot be a theophoric name, for Thracian epigraphy and archaeology show no trace of such a deity. Furthermore, the Greek instances of *Kotys*, though very widely scattered, do not in fact extend to the very places where the goddess and the festival are heard of: Corinth and Sicily.²⁰ *Kotys* is unrelated.

The names *Kotyia* and *Kotyô* are enigmatic. It is always assumed that the goddess *Kotyô*, or *Kotys* as a supposed variant, comes first and that the festival is named for her. It has also been argued that this supposedly Thracian goddess was adopted at Corinth and in Sicily because of a resemblance to the Dorian Artemis, herself worshipped with masking and lascivious dances.²¹ By the fifth century, the argument runs, such worship was deemed inappropriate to Artemis; so *Kotyô* took her place. But it cannot be that *Kotyô* also gave the name *Kotyia* to older rites of Artemis, for nothing is more tenacious than the names of rites and festivals. The argument collapses. And not only is the Thracian background illusory, but a Greek goddess *Kotyô*, unheard of but for a like-named festival, is impossible to credit. Since most festivals are named not for deities but for ritual, these

“*κοτυτ- rites*” undoubtedly refer to some ritual object or action or setting we can no longer recognize.²² The person *Kotyô* is secondary, being either a notional goddess or a princess of legend, both assigned to Corinth (schol. Pind. *Ol.* 13.56b, schol. Theocr. *Id.* 6.40b).

The record begins with Eupolis' lost play, burlesquing the authentic rites (*Baptae* frs. 76–98 K-A, test. i-vi on pp. 331–33).²³ Allusions in Juvenal and other Roman poets and in Synesius may be indebted either to Eupolis directly or to comment by Eratosthenes in his work *On Old Comedy* (Cic. *Ad Att.* 6.1.8 = *FGrH* 241 F 19, cf. Duris *FGrH* 76 F 73 = Eupolis test. 3 p. 295 K-A) and thereafter by Didymus in his *Comic Speech* (schol. Apoll. Rhod. 4.143–44a = Eupolis fr. 83 K-A).²⁴ Eupolis showed certain effeminate Athenians, Alcibiâdes and his friends, dancing for *Kotyô*, who is described as *psaltria dea* “a harpist goddess” (schol. Juv. 2.92 = *Baptae* test. ii pp. 331–32 K-A).²⁵ Alcibiades, it is said, took revenge by throwing Eupolis overboard as they sailed to Sicily (schol. Ael. Arist. *Or.* 3.8 = *Baptae* test. iii p. 332 K-A). In an epigram that goes with the story, Eupolis “immerses” Alcibiades on stage, and Alcibiades “immerses” Eupolis in the sea:

*βάπτες . . . βαπτίζων ὀλέσω.*²⁶

Juvenal's scholia assert offhand that the title *Baptae* denotes the effeminate persons mocked in the play, but we need not believe it. These Banrai, whether the chorus or principals in the action, must agree with the story. That is, they must “immerse” others. Alcibiades

was himself immersed. Perhaps his friends were immersed as well, so as to require a corresponding number of *baptai*. Alcibiades was totally immersed since he did the same to Eupolis. If Alcibiades and others merely “dyed” their locks or their gorgeous robes (another meaning of βάπτω), drowning Eupolis was not a fair riposte. It is rightly inferred by a majority of critics that the *Kotyia* featured a ritual bath.²⁷

The epigram, contrasting the bath on stage with one “in the waves of the sea,” shows that this was not represented as a sea bath at Peiraeus or Phalerum. Alcibiades was immersed in a tank or basin, and he and perhaps his friends must have been assisted by officiants called *baptai*. A bath at Erythrae serving as a rite of initiation is administered to a man or woman by a public priest or priestess of the *Korybantes* (*IvErythrai* 206 lines 6–12); another at Lebadeia preparatory to consulting the oracle of *Trophônios* is administered by two boy attendants (Paus. 9.39.8). Both the initiation rite and the oracular procedure are in fact derived from the age-old worship of the Mother at her festival *Kronia*. To say this summarily will not be convincing, and to go into it at length is not practical. Instead, the bath of the *Kotyia* can be placed in a general context.

Ritual baths of various kinds are common, as shown by the full and careful survey of R. Ginouves.²⁸ Most often, they are decorous and even solemn and serve to purify a worshipper. But in cults of Hera or Artemis, or of Dionysus or Poseidon, and especially in a rural setting, refreshment or recreation is more in evidence.²⁹ It suits the purpose of the worship, which is to stimulate a part of nature. It will suit the purpose of the *Kotyia* as well; it is in tune with other exuberant behavior to be mentioned.

But what was so outrageous about the bath as to call for deadly vengeance? Juvenal’s scholia, while overlooking the bath, say that the dance was “in imitation of women,” and also that “effeminates” worshipped *Kotytdô*. It is sometimes supposed that male transvestites were part of the ritual.³⁰ This is unnecessary and unlikely. Both men and women, we shall see, behaved lewdly at the festival. Alcibiades as a notorious effeminate, who lisped and salved and primped like a woman, chose also to dance and bathe as wanton women did at the *Kotyia*, and the spectacle was outrageous.

The story that Alcibiades drowned Eupolis on the voyage to Sicily is significant in another way. To refute the story, Eratosthenes had only to observe that some of Eupolis’ plays were later than the Sicilian expedition.³¹ It must be that the play itself referred to the expedition, and that the antics of the *Kotyia* had to do with Sicily. They were not actually being introduced to Athens by Alcibiades or anyone else, for we never hear of them again in Athenian literature or documents. Eupolis pretended that Alcibiades as a prime mover of the Sicilian

expedition was taking up Sicilian custom.

The *Kotytia* in Sicily

After Eupolis' play, other evidence is of various kinds. The names *Κοτυτίων* and *Κοτυτίς*, formed from the festival as *Κρονίων* is formed from *Κρόνια*, happen to occur just at Chersonesus and Callatis on the Black Sea, so that they are sometimes lumped with Thracian names.³² But since Chersonesus is a colony of Megara, and Callatis was cofounded by Heraclea a colony of Megara, these instances converge with Selinus.

Elsewhere in Sicily, Corinth may be the source.

Κότας and *Κότης*, abbreviated forms, are now attested by inscriptions at Camarina, Acragas, and Melita (*LGPN* IIIA). Theocritus' *Idyll* 6, a singing match in Sicily, offers a piece of local color in the name *Κοτυτταρίς* for a superstitious old woman (line 40); the scholia correctly trace it to *Kotytia* or *Kotytdō*.³³ Now apropos of Eupolis *Kotytdō* is said to be *φορτικόν τινα δαίμονα* "a vulgar deity" at Corinth (Hsch. s.v. = *Baptae* fr. 93 K-A). A Corinthian princess is also so named (schol. Pind. *Ol.* 13.56b, schol. Theocr. *Id.* 6.40b = Hippostratus *FGrH* 568 F6). She figures in the *aition* of another Corinthian festival, the *Hellotia*, celebrated at the same season as the *Kotytia*, in early summer.³⁴ Hippostratus the author of Sicilian genealogies said that she helped the Heracleidae to take over Corinth. Since Archias the founder of Syracuse is of the line of Heracleidae, Hippostratus may have explained the festival *Kotytia* of Syracuse or Sicily by reference to the princess *Kotytdō* of Corinth.

The festival itself and the proverbial *ἄρπαγὰ Κοτυτίοις* "snatching at the *Kotytia*" and the special term *δραξίων* "snatcher" are all assigned to Sicily.³⁵ The snatching is of cakes and nuts hung from branches (Zenob. *Ath.* 3.112 Bühler = [Plut.] *Prov. Alex.* 1.78). The snatchers go after barley meal and the like in the agora (Gloss. Ital. fr.

202 K-A, *PCG* 1 p. 325 = Et. Gen., Hsch. s. *δραξίων*). Eratosthenes, presumably in his comment on Eupolis, is cited for yet another term,

κασιπήδαλος (Et. Gen. *ibid.*).³⁶ It is elsewhere defined as one jumping up after those with the barley meal (Hsch. s.v.), as if

< *κάπτω* + *πηδάω*. These are different targets—cakes and nuts hung from branches, barley meal in the agora—but the frantic snatching is the same. Either the custom varied from place to place, or it regularly took more than one form.

The same word *δραξών*, still in Sicily, means both a “shrine” and a “brothel keeper” (Etym. Magn. *ibid.*).³⁷ Another proverbial

snatching, *ἄρπαγὰ τὰ Κοινάρου*, is assigned precisely to Selinus and gives rise to a story about a brothel keeper and the riches he bequeathed to the city (Timaeus *FGh* 566 F 148, Callim. *Iambus* 11, fr. 201).³⁸ *Konnaros*, though Callimachus insisted that the true name was *Konnidas*, was a metic and grew rich from keeping a brothel, and always said that he would distribute his goods to Aphrodite and his friends. His will was afterwards found to contain those proverbial words, and “so the people left the theater”—where they were doubtless gathered only to hear a matter of public interest—and snatched the things of *Konnidas*.³⁹ The *diêgêsis* to the poem, all that survives, quotes the opening line, in which *Konnidas* speaks from his tomb and swears by the local river Hypsas (*Belice*).⁴⁰

The story is an *aition*, and we must determine what is being explained and how it is done. *ἄρπαγὰ τὰ Κοινάρου* “snatching: things of *Konnaros*” is the original custom, and will go back to the fifth century, when Selinus was a flourishing city and celebrated, as we now know, the festival *Kotyia*. The “snatching” thus defined is likely to be another form of the “snatching at the *Kotyia*”; the lexicists told us that the snatching was indeed diverse. Now *Κόνναρος* is the jujube tree and its luscious and serviceable fruit, which keeps without being preserved and is easily used as sweetener and flavoring.⁴¹ Cakes and nuts might be “things of jujube,” or might go with them. According to the story, such tasty treats were first made available for general snatching by Jujube the brothel keeper, who saw fit to leave his wealth to Aphrodite and his friends, but happened to express himself in his will with the customary words.

After Selinus revived in the fourth century as a largely Punic city, the major shrines were frequented once again, as we can see on the *Gaggera* hill (chapters 12–13). The old festival *Kotyia* would be somehow observed but perhaps not with the same high spirits. The snatching custom and its proverb were open to misunderstanding, as by Timaeus and others who might write about Selinus. *Κόνναρος* “Jujube” is a strange name; any rationalizing writer will think it an improvement to substitute the actual name *Κόννιδας*, patronymic of *Κόννος*.⁴² And the tomb cited by Callimachus may have been a real one, with just this name. Callimachus as often draws on some near contemporary source, most likely Timaeus, for a learned variation.

A brothel keeper and his friends as principals in the story, and the secondary meaning “brothel keeper” for any “snatcher,” and the implication of the story that Aphrodite is a power honored by the snatching, all suggest that the festival custom, besides being

exuberantly rough and wild, was indecent in act or appearance. Eupolis and his audience knew of lewd dancing and obscene bathing. Two further items, deriving either from Eupolis' play or from notices thereof, speak of priapic deities or celebrants. Synesius in one of his learned allusions to *Kotyô* associates her with "the Attic *Κονίσσαλοι*" (*Epist.* 32), and a lexicon gives *Ἰθύφαλλοι* as the name of a "rite for *Kotyô*" (*Lex. rhet.* s. *εἰθύφαλλοι*, *Anecd. Bekker* 1.246).⁴³ We recall that the presiding deity is also conceived as a vulgar male, obviously in the image of the worshippers (Hsch. s. *Kotyô*, cited above).

Solstice Festivals

Such is the evidence for the festival *Kotyia*. It cannot all be firmly grasped or distinctly seen, but all of it points the same way. Scholars have been slow to follow. They speak of a harvest festival or the like. The bough hung with cakes and nuts is compared with the *eiresiônê*, a bough hung with fruits in season, a "maypole," carried round by children in spring and autumn.⁴⁴ But the *eiresiônê* was not an object of horseplay.⁴⁵ It was carried from door to door as a blessing and at the end was affixed, still intact, to a house or temple.⁴⁶ Here the whole emphasis is on mischievous snatching, and the bough is not the only target, and the season is not spring or autumn but summer, when no particular crops are gathered.

The festival business, even if some of it remains unclear, belongs to a definite category, that of solstice festivals. The summer solstice is at hand, or as close as it can be in a monthly calendar, and the outrageous conduct—jumping up and snatching and exhibitionist dances and baths and whatever else—typify the category. Festivals marking the solstice, whether of summer or winter, all have this in common, that they are times of license, when norms of behavior are flouted or inverted. Celebrants may be thievish, lewd, and insubordinate, as at the *Kotyia*. The license has its purpose. The whole order of nature is turning right around and is stimulated and reinforced by a like effort from humankind. In an agrarian society, the order of nature means chiefly fertility. Greek festivals at the winter solstice are often addressed to Poseidon, the god of rushing waters that renew nature.⁴⁷ Those at the summer solstice are often addressed to the Mother, the goddess of mountain springs and pastures, which are then the only part of nature still flourishing.⁴⁸

The Mother's festival is the *Kronia* and is mostly heard of in Ionian cities, where it produces the Ionian month name *Kronion*. At Athens it is attested as the former name of *Hekatombaion* = July.⁴⁹ Elsewhere the Apolline month name appears to vary between June

and July; perhaps *Kronion* once did so as well. The festival name was so renowned that it was sometimes adopted in cities elsewhere or, more likely, lent its name additionally to preexisting custom (it was even equated willy-nilly with Rome's festival of the winter solstice, the *Saturnalia*).⁵⁰ But apart from borrowings we expect an original solstice celebration among Dorians, as well as Ionians. The *Kotytia* are a Dorian instance at Corinth and in Sicily. The *Kotytia* are not addressed to the Mother but to a power only vaguely nameable as an eponym.

The similarities go further. For the *Kronia*, the only calendar date that is quite secure is at Athens, *Hekatombaion* 12 (Dem. 24 *Tim.* 26): almost midmonth, almost the full moon in a lunar month. A corresponding date can be inferred for the *Kotytia*, as we shall soon see, inasmuch as Selinus' celebration is equivalent to the beginning of the Olympic truce. *Kronia*, we should observe, is a good example of a descriptive name for ritual that was misunderstood.⁵¹ Though this is demonstrably a festival of the Mother alone, the name was taken as denoting a notional god *Kronos*, who was accordingly exalted as her consort. The presiding deity of the *Kotytia* is likewise a mere eponym and was sometimes conceived as male rather than female. The lewdness seemed a tribute to Aphrodite, as did that of the *Kronia* and of Poseidon's solstice festival.⁵²

The *Kotytia* then are a version of the festival of license at the summer solstice. The celebrants at Selinus were undoubtedly aware that it coincided with the Mother's festival elsewhere. A figurine of the Mother, showing her as usual enthroned in a *naiskos* and holding a lion cub and dating to the sixth century, was found in the earlier temple of Demeter *malophoros*—Demeter and the Mother always had a strong affinity.⁵³ Selinus' dithyrambic poet Telestes, who won a victory at Athens in 402/401 B.c.—when his own city was in ruins—evoked the Mother's festival at Olympia by describing how Pelops and his Lydian companions sang and danced her tunes (*PMG* fr. 810).⁵⁴

The Olympic Truce

From the *Kotytia* we turn to the Olympic truce. The dating of the truce, as of the Olympic Games, has long been an open question, but with our awareness of the solstice festival we may hope to find the answer.⁵⁵ Comparable truces offer guidance.

Two truces exactly known, for the *Greater* and the *Lesser Mysteries* at Athens, each run for almost two full months, a whole month before and some twenty days after the festival. They both start at midmonth. For the *Greater*, it is from 15 *Metageitniôn* through *Boêdromiôn* to 10 *Pyanopsiôn* (*IG* 1³ 6 B 17–27, “*ante a.* 460”).⁵⁶ The festival days were

15–21 *Boêdromiôn* or possibly 15–22, but no more.⁵⁷ For the *Lesser*, it is from 15 *Gamêliôn* through *Anthesterion* to 10 *Elaphebolion* (IG 1³ 6 B 36–47). The festival days are not recorded but were very likely 15–17 *Anthesterion*, days when the assembly never met.⁵⁸ In view of the truce and on the analogy of the *Greater Mysteries*, the *Lesser Mysteries* must have begun at midmonth.⁵⁹ They would not continue nearly as long as the *Greater*, where the whole body of worshippers were active first at Athens and the nearby shore, paused for a day or two, and only then went on to Eleusis. So the tenth of the following month, as the closing date for both truces, seems to be a pattern, not a consequence of the festival dates. The truce for the *Ptoia* of Acraephiae, as prescribed in an Amphictyonic decree of 182–179 b.c., also starts at midmonth—on 15 *Hippodromios* in the Boeotian calendar, 15 *Apellaios* in the Delphian (IG 7.4135–36 = *SIG*³ 635 lines 10–12). The festival date is unknown, but if it was not the next midmonth, the midmonth dating of the truce is even more significant.

The Olympic truce was doubtless a model for others. The midmonth to midmonth scheme is very apt, inasmuch as the Olympic Games come round at a full moon of summer. The truce, quite as much as the games themselves, would be suitably fixed to a full moon, the most definite and manifest sign in the sky, perhaps the only sign that Greeks everywhere could be sure of observing and agreeing on. The midmonth dates in the Athenian and other calendars are thus a relic of the full-moon dating of the Olympic truce. The Olympic Games, however, begin four days before the full moon and end two days after.⁶⁰ A truce starting at the previous full moon offers less time than those calendar truces at Athens. More important, the athletes were bound to arrive in Elis thirty days before the games, or perhaps before the full moon of the games (Philostr. *V. Apoll.* 5.43).⁶¹ So they were on the road or at sea for some time before that, and needed such a truce. It must have started two moons before. After the conclusion of the *Mysteries*, those calendar truces offer upward of twenty days. The Olympic truce, if it were the model, would then last nearly three months overall.⁶² Even so, the Athenians did not undervalue their *Mysteries*, for together the two truces make nearly four months.

As for the Olympic Games, there is considerable evidence that they came sometimes at the second, sometimes at the third full moon after the solstice. Two scholia to Pindar, though corrupt and of unknown origin, contain three converging statements that are unlikely to be compromised by any corruption.⁶³ The span is said to be the Egyptian months *Thoth* and *Mesori* (schol. Pind. *Ol.* 3.35), which as synchronized with the Julian calendar ran from 25 July to 27 September.⁶⁴ The date in the Eleian calendar, beginning at the winter solstice, is said to be the eighth month, i.e. August (schol. Pind. *Ol.*

3.33a).⁶⁵ And the extreme range is said to be from the beginning of *opora*, i.e. the rising of Sirius on 28 July, to the rising of Arcturus, i.e. about 19 September (ibid.).⁶⁶ Such are the general statements. The two historical instances that can be made out confirm this range of variation.⁶⁷ The games of 480 b.c., which coincided (or nearly) with the battle of Thermopylae, undoubtedly came at the second full moon of 19 August (Hdt. 7.206.2, 8.26.2, 72).⁶⁸ And the games of 44 B.c., which Cicero was thought to be making for in midAugust, undoubtedly came at the third full moon, on 29 August (Cic. Att. 16.7 = 415 Shackleton Bailey).⁶⁹

If the Olympic truce started two moons before the games, that full moon was near the solstice, on 28 June. In 480 B.c. the truce would start at the full moon of 22 June, just before the solstice. In 44 B.c. it would start at the full moon of 30 June, just after the solstice. If the full moon of the truce can come either before or after the solstice, the rule must be that the truce starts at the full moon closest to it. The truce in fact determines the date of the Olympic Games, and since the full moon comes before and after in successive Olympiads, it is bound up with the Olympic *oktaeteris* and the alternating intervals of forty-nine and fifty months.⁷⁰

The truce then begins round the summer solstice, the time of the solstice festival. As was said, the festival mostly belongs to the Mother and is mostly called *Kronia*. The Mother's worship and the festival nomenclature are conspicuous at Olympia. They are present in the oldest traditions and in the earliest archaeological remains. They continue strongly in the Classical period in allusions by Pindar and Telestes, in the building history of the *altis*, and in the miracle of Sosipolis that attended the Anolympiad of 364 B.c. They contribute largely to Pausanias' picture of the early days at Olympia, of *Kronos* wrestling Zeus and of Idaean *Daktyloi* racing for the olive crown. And they are implicit in the heading of column A of our tablet, as the Panhellenic equivalent of the *Kotyia*.

1. JJK 20–23, 51.

2. Casabona (1966, 9–11).

3. The letters that still faintly appear could be attributed to either of the two successive hands, that of lines 1–3 or that of lines 7–24.

4. So Dubois (1995a, 557; 1995b, 131), Graham (1995, 367), Clinton (1996, 160–61). Siewert (2002, 366) adopts this meaning but regards the sacrifices as belonging to the announcement of the truce (chapter 6, note 1).

5. JJK 27 infer that the truce sometimes came earlier than the *Kotyia*, for otherwise, they say, it would not be mentioned at all.

6. Cordano (1996, 138; 1997, 425) speaks of "the insertion of a local festival in the current Olympiad," and infers that the Olympic Games were used to regulate Selinus' calendar. On the contrary, the mention of these alternatives, local festival and Olympic truce, shows that Selinus' calendar was independent of the games.

7. Trumpy (1997, 147–55, cf. 81–88), the beginning of the year in this calendar. It is best known at Byzantium, otherwise at Megara, Chalcidion, Callatis, and Chersonesus Taurica, not at all at Selinus or Megara Hyblaea.

8. The evidence for these statements—the corrupt and controversial scholia to Pindar, *OL* 33a, 35—is discussed below.

9. Clinton (1996, 161–63), Curti and van Bremen (1999, 25–28, 31), Henrichs (2005, 53).

10. If the fourth-year Olympic truce were only an alternative, says Clinton (1996, 161), it would be so stated in a different form of words: perhaps

πένπτοι δὲ Φέτει κτλ. This is much too strict for any language. The order of words, “before the *Kotytiā* and (before) the truce” when it occurs, shows that the truce is a lesser alternative.

11. So Clinton 1996. To accommodate a list of annual and biennial sacrifices on a scale projected from these supposed quadrennial items, the size of the tablet would need to be multiplied many times, with the other column blank. Or this tablet would need to follow many more, all with the other column blank. For Clinton supposes that column B, in prescribing rites out of calendar order, began only when the calendar list ended, and was reached by walking round the end of a table.

12. See [chapter 2](#), p. 32. The calendar format is doubted by Curti and van Bremen (1999, 31), who further observe that surviving calendars do not go into such details of ritual as our tablet.

13. Curti and van Bremen (1999, 27).

14. Rausch (2000a, 47). JJK 26n5 seem to toy with such a view when they remark that it is the two festivals *Skira* and the Mysteries “before” which certain sacrifices are prescribed in the calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis, and before which purifying rites for Zeus *melichios* might be thought to occur in the lore of the *Dios kōdion*.

15. “Midsummer,” say JJK 26, is the time of the *Kotytiā*, and it does not match any agricultural event, and so this festival is more likely “an annual renewal before which” pollution must “be cleared away.” But “midsummer,” say JJK 27, is the time of the Olympic Games, and the truce probably ran for a month beforehand and therefore started at the time of the *Kotytiā*, “in early summer,” and it was “before both of these festivals” that “pollution had to be removed.” These inconsistencies reflect the difficulty of finding any explanation.

16. Srebrny (1936) is a thorough and, on some points, conclusive study.

17. Lobeck (1829, 1014–23). Much of his argument is to the effect that such despicable practices as Eupolis portrays could only be a private cult imported from Thrace. JJK 25 think of *Kotyto* as a “polymorphous name” occurring in both Thrace and Greece, first muddled by Eupolis; this seems very improbable.

18. To say that *Kotys* is brother of *Atys* (Hdt. 4.45.3, cf. 1.7.3) or else his father (Dion. Hal. *Ant.* 1.27.1) within the royal line of Lydia is to acknowledge Thracians and Phrygians as leading nations of Asia. Nicolaus of Damascus in a story possibly taken from Ctesias tells of an early *Kotys* as king of Thrace (*FGrH* 90 F 71). The dynastic name is thus taken back much farther than any historical instance of the name.

19. Strabo alleges Thracian *Κότυα* (*Κόπτια*, *Κοτύτ(τ)ια* deteriores) as a doublet, exquisitely rare, of the well-known Thracian *Bendideia*, alleging also mention of *Κότυος* (*Κόπτουος deteriores*) in Aeschylus’ *Edonians* but quoting rather the invocation of an orgiastic goddess who was probably unnamed,

σεμνὰ κόπτουσ’ ὄργια κτλ. (*Κότυς deteriores*). Since Lobeck, editors of Strabo and of Aeschylus have restored *Kotytiā*, *Kotyto* throughout. It was however only the fancy of some ancient scholar to say that the goddess

invoked by Aeschylus (perhaps Bendis or Artemis) was a certain “*Kotys*” worshipped with “*Kotyran*” rites. The goddess *Kotyō* of Corinth and Sicily and reputedly Athens was no part of his fancy, or Strabo would say so; the scandalous rites in Eupolis would be very pertinent.

20. *LGPV* I, II, IIIA and B, covering most of the Greek world, supply only fifteen

instances of *Κότυς*, as against eighty-two instances in *LGPV* IV, covering “Macedonia, Thrace, northern regions of the Black Sea.”

21. Srebrny (1936, 437–46), Nilsson (1955, 835–36).

22. In just this vein, though without discounting the goddess, JJK 25 suggest that the name *Kotyia* refers to the bough with cakes and nuts that figured in the festival, being derived from Semitic *qt* “cut,” “pluck.” It is however merely fanciful to say that “for Archaic Corinth a Near Eastern source is not out of the question.” Dubois (1995b, 132) objects to “a Near Eastern etymology” but only to uphold the Thracian origin.

23. Storey (2003, 94–111) now provides the fullest discussion of the play.

24. It was demonstrated by Srebrny (1931; 1936, 423–28), after being long suspected, that later writers, notably Juvenal and his scholia, were misled by Eupolis into situating the actual cult at Athens. Storey (2003, 98–100) largely agrees. Courtney on Juv. *Sat.* 6.91–92 should not have disputed it, nor JJK 24.

25. As to dancing and effeminacy cf. frs. 81–83, 88, 92–94.

26. = Page, *FGE* Alcibiades 1 = West, *IEG* 2, Alcibiades. *βάπτες μ' ἐν*

Meineke (*madefecisti* Valla): *βάπτε με ἐν* mss: *alii alia*.

27. They are listed by Storey (2003, 95n3). Whether *βάπτω* was then a proper term for a ritual bath can be debated. Lobeck (1829, 1008–11) argued that it was, as against Meineke, who ascribed it to Eupolis. Yet both agreed on a ritual bath. Meineke's later suggestion, that Alcibiades was seen to foppishly “dye” his hair (and drowned Eupolis for this mortal insult), seems merely contrarious, another thrust in their continuing dispute. It has however been duly canvassed ever since, as by Ginouves (1962, 397–98), Parker (1983, 306), and Storey (2003, 96–98). Storey inclines to a further variation—a chorus of *baptai* were so named for gorgeous robes and frizzled hair—but also thinks that “dipping” connotes anal intercourse.

28. Ginouves (1962, 375–428).

29. For baths associated with Hera, Artemis, and Dionysus, see Ginouves 1962, 382–85. While observing that they hardly purify, he speaks rather of a “passage” or an “initiation.” They are also associated in myth and anecdote with Poseidon, and on one occasion the courtesan Phryne was lewdly ogled: Robertson (1984a, 11–12).

30. Nilsson (1955, 835–36), Courtney on Juv. 2.91–92.

31. Eupolis is also said to have perished in shipwreck at the Hellespont, so that poets were exempted henceforth from military service (Sud. s.v. = test. 1 p. 294 K-A), which sounds like a fiction suggested by a fact. Furthermore, the name “Eupolis” appears in a casualty list of c. 411 b.c. (*IG* 1³ 1190 line 52), and nothing in Eupolis' fragments is to be dated after 412. So Nesselrath (2000, 234–35) thinks of death at sea in 412/11 as a bare fact embellished by the drowning story of 415. But Alcibiades was active in the Hellespont in 412/11—why then did he not take his revenge in this theater of action? And can the same event give rise to both the drowning story and the poets' exemption? Curiously, “tombs” of Eupolis were shown as well in Sicyon and on Aegina: test. 4–5 K-A, cf. Lefkowitz (1981, 115).

32. *SEG* 37.661, 42.691, 46.921, 49.1031 (Chersonesus), 45.923 (Callatis), *LGPV* IV s. *Korvrls* and *Korvrlōv*. Megara is no doubt the ultimate source for Callatis as it is the direct source for Chersonesus. At Chersonesus the name occurs on a fifth-

century ostrakon, the earliest evidence of all. As to the alleged Thracian origin see SEG 45.977 and 46.921.

33. The name *Kvrírapis* is used for a phenomenally old woman at A.P. 11.72 = GP Bassus? 10, without any further point that we can see.

34. When the sisters *Hellotis* and *Kotyô* sought refuge in Athena's temple, it burned down with *Hellotis* inside, but *Kotyô* escaped. Athena's festival *Hellotia* as the subject of the story likewise belongs to early summer—see Robertson (1985, 247–48)—and this was doubtless a reason why the eponym of the *Kotyia* was brought into it.

35. Another Dorian instance of this common word is Epicharmus'

Ἀρπαγαί, play known from a number of literary citations and a papyrus list of titles (test. 36, frs. 9–13 K-A). O. Crusius identified it as the source of both

ἄρπαγὰ Κοτυτίους and another proverbial phrase discussed below, *ἄρπαγὰ τὰ Κοινάρου*. Yet the evidence for the phrases does not at all suggest that they derive from a single work of literature. Apart from the source question, Epicharmus' title may still refer to the festival custom, given the celebrity of the *Kotyia*. But other "snatchings"—or "rapes" or "robberies"—are surely not beyond the bounds of a comic poet's imagination.

36. A somehow opprobrious term applied by Lucian to an Eleusinian priest is now read as *ἐγκαμφικήδαλος* (46 Lex. 10 Macleod), so it cannot be related,

as was formerly suggested (cf. Latte, *Mantissa ad Hsch.* *κασιπήδαλος*) and is still by K-A *loc. cit.* The meaning *pene flexibili praeditus*? is entertained by Macleod *ad loc.* LSJ Rev. Suppl. s.v. register the new word but perpetuate an old meaning, "onion eating," as if *< κάπτω, κίδαλον*, which is no longer tenable.

37. Srebrny (1936, 434) in discussing Etym. Magn. *σ. δραξίων* omits the definition "brothel keeper" as irrelevant, but it plainly goes with the rest.

38. When only Timaeus was in hand, Srebrny did not associate

ἄρπαγὰ τὰ Κοινάρου with *ἄρπαγὰ Κοτυτίους*, though Lobeck (1829, 1031n40) had done so. JJK 24n4 still hesitate.

39. The location of Selinus' theater is unknown but is not material to the story.

40. It may be that his tomb is on the riverbank:

ἀλλ' οὐ τὸν Ὑψάν, ὃς τὸ σᾶμά μεν / [e.g. παραρρέει] or that he adjures the river while addressing a passerby elsewhere:

ὃς ... / [e.g. παραστείχεις]. So Kerkhecker (1999, 214–15), citing Gallavotti and Dawson respectively. Coins of Selinus and personal names pay tribute to the Hypsas: Curbera (1998, 55). It is however three and a half kilometers east of the city, so that it too had no part in the story.

41. Agathocles FGtH 472 F 4 as a full account of it mentions all these points.

42. *Κόννος* occurs at Styra and Athens (LGPN I-II, three instances), the secondary forms *Κοννίς* at Rhodes (LGPN I), *Κοννᾶς, Κόννιον, Κοννῦς* at Athens, *Κοννακίς* at Tarentum (LGPN IIIA). The patronymic *Κοννίδας* is recorded only as a hero of cult said to be Theseus' *paidasogós*. and only as a variant of *Κονείδης*, clearly the eponym of the *genos* *Κονεῖδαι* (for references, see Parker [1996, 302]). The latter forms are

no doubt original, and *Korvīdas* averistic substitute, as in Selinus' proverb.

43. Herter (1926, 24–27, 49–50, 52, 55) and *RE* 19.2 (1938) 1698, 1715 s. Phallos, Srebrny (1936, 424–26). *Konisalos* “Dust-cloud” is a puzzling name for an ithyphallic deity or performer; Herter (1926, 27–29 and *RE* 19.2, 1693–94) reviews the explanations hitherto proposed. Probably the word was first transferred to a kind of “dance” (Hsch. s.v.), a whirling or capering dance. The treats that were the target of jumping up and snatching must themselves have been carried at full tilt. The festival *Kronia*, and afterward the *Iakchos* procession to Eleusis, featured a whirling dance by *kernophoroi*, who carried various treats in the *kernos*, a large bowl with a collar of small ones—but there was no snatching that we hear of. On Thera, the instrumental dative *Kovia'oi* describing a homosexual conquest (IG 12.3.540 iii) may just as well refer to a dance as to the penis (K. J. Dover's suggestion [1988, 126]).

44. Nilsson (1906, 433; 1955, 835), Srebrny (1936, 433–36, 446–47), JJK 25, Lupu (2005, 369).

45. Srebrny (1936, 433Π4) cites Mannhardt for “the plundering of the maypole... especially in the Rhineland,” but maypole customs are not relevant.

46. Robertson (1984b, 388–95). At Athens and some other cities a communal *eiresione* was carried in a stately procession, with the child assisted by father or uncle.

47. Robertson (1984a).

48. Robertson (1996a, 290–92); cf. Robertson (1991a, 8–10; 1991b, 67–68; 1992, 27–30).

49. *Kronion* in six Ionian calendars: Triimpy (1997, index 1 s.v. *Kronion* at Athens); Plut. *Thes.* 12.2 (“*Kronios*”), Et. Magn. s. *Hekatombaiōn* (*Kronion*).

50. *Kronia* and *Saturnalia* together have often been likened to Semitic rites occurring from Babylon to Palestine and from the Bronze Age to early Christian times. Burkert (1993, 18–23) now improves on this by adducing the Hurrian “Song of Release” lately published from the archives of Boghazkoi: Haas (1994, 549–53). The first part, Teshub's reception by Allani in the underworld, is a festival *aition* set at Ebla in its great days, and the “release” of the title, also enjoined on the king of Ebla in the last part, echoes that of the jubilee year in *Leviticus* 25. Such parallels of a general kind are not relevant here. But the Greek evidence is said to show “that the *Kronia* festival was a secondary element spreading by diffusion through a limited area” (Burkert 1993, 17). A great deal of recent argument is here traversed.

51. Perhaps *kronia* = *kernea* “rites (or things) of the *kernos*,” since this composite vessel filled with a variety of fruits and liquids was conspicuous in the hands and on the heads of officiants: Robertson (1996a, 282–86); cf. note 43.

52. Cf. Robertson (1984a, 12).

53. Sfameni Gasparro (1973, 119, 276–77). A similar figurine, likewise an import, perhaps from Rhodes and datable from the context before the mid-sixth century, was found in Demeter's sanctuary at Bitalemi near Gela: Sfameni Gasparro (1973, 115–19).

54. For the interpretation of the fragment, see Robertson (1996a, 295–98, 301–2). Telestes alone, let us note in passing, suffices to expose the modern myth that the Mother's worship had been imported into Greece not long before. Its sensational beginning is here ascribed to a primordial figure of the Heroic Age. Similar stories are told of the similar worship of Dionysus, and until lately it and they were elaborately misconstrued—but not with such extreme anachronism.

55. JJK 27 and Clinton (1996, 161) think of the truce as starting a month before the games: much too short, as we shall see. Miller (1974, 220–22) equates the truce with the preliminary exercises of the previous thirty days and with the *hieromenia* and with “the Olympic month” of Eleian documents. But the preliminary exercises could begin only when the athletes had arrived under truce, and *hieromenia* is an

elastic term when it is not the month, whether lunar or calendar, of the games, and “the Olympic month” designates that calendar month, which alternated between *Apollônios* and *Parthenios*. Weniger was nearly right in making it three full months, but not quite, and his arguments must be partly rejected (see note 63).

56. It is not accurate to say, as do JJK 27, that this truce began a month before the festival and *ended ten days after it*.

57. Robertson (1998a, 562–66; 1999a, 15–20).

58. The absence of recorded assembly meetings is an important criterion for festival dates, established by Mikalson (1975). After the festival *Anthesteria* of 11–13 *Anthesterion*, no meetings are on record until 18–19 *Anthesterion*, two busy days: Mikalson (1975, 114–16). A day’s interval must be postulated between the *Anthesteria* and the *Lesser Mysteries*.

59. There has been a persistent inclination to date the *Lesser Mysteries* to 20 *Anthesterion* and the days round it: Mommsen (1898, 406), Jameson (1965, 160), Mikalson (1975, 120–21). It is quite unwarranted. Mommsen held up the coordinate truces for the *Greater* and *Lesser Mysteries* without seeing that they imply the same beginning at midmonth. Instead he deduced 20 *Anthestêriôn* from 20 *Boêdromiôn*, the Iacchus procession, alleging it to be the centerpiece of the *Greater Mysteries*. Jameson says “around the middle of the month” but then cites Mommsen for “the chief day.” Since 20–26 *Anthestêriôn* is another run of days without assembly meetings, Mikalson thinks that the *Lesser Mysteries* occupy several of them—and somehow comprehend another festival, the *Diasia* of 23 *Anthestêriôn*, which is impossible. Since at least a day must intervene between festivals, only 20–21 *Anthestêriôn* or 25–26 are available for the *Lesser Mysteries*. The three-day run at midmonth is much to be preferred, as giving the needed time and because important festivals, especially agrarian ones, mostly fall in the second decad and close to the full moon: Trumpy (1998, 110–12).

60. Weniger (1904), L. Ziehen, *RE* 18.1 (1939) 10–16 s. Olympia, Mallwitz (1972, 69–70).

61. The preliminary exercises in Elis are often mentioned elsewhere, but not the exact duration. Weniger (1905b, 201) rightly observes that they presuppose the truce. According to Ziehen, *RE* 18.1, 7, the thirty-day duration “belongs only to a later time” and is due to “the claims of increasing professional athletics.” There is no reason why a later time and professional athletics should require either a longer truce or exercises in Elis; rather the opposite.

62. Weniger (1905b, 196–218) argues on other grounds for an Olympic truce of three whole months, but three months in the Eleian calendar, the alternating month of the games and the two months before that. The arguments for three Eleian months, based mainly on the rotation of Eleian officials in documents at Olympia, are the weakest and are justly criticized by Ziehen, *RE* 18.1, 5. But he well shows that the truce must have been a long one, so as to cover both a safe journey from distant parts and the great fair, which was an attraction in itself. Despite Ziehen, these conditions obtained from the time, in the early seventh century, when the games began to be widely attended.

63. The scholia, often discussed, are printed by Miller (1974, 216–17) just as they appear in the manuscripts (five manuscripts for schol. *Ol.* 3.35 but only one for schol. *Ol.* 3.33a). Jacoby, Comarchus *FGRH*410 F 1 gives the fullest apparatus for “the gravely corrupted” schol. *Ol.* 3.33a, while introducing some corrections—including *Komarchos*, whose existence hangs on this and schol. Plat. *Phaedo* 89C = *FGRH* 410 F 2.

64. See Samuel (1972, 177, 191–94). Samuel would discount the statement but on no sufficient grounds. This was not an “Egyptian scholiast,” and his intention was to date the festival by a reliable and widely known calendar, not to assert an exact

correspondence between Egyptian months and the Eleian months *Apollōnios* and *Parthenios*.

65. It is said that the cycle begins with an Eleian month “at which the winter solstice occurs” and that “every Olympic celebration (*πᾶσα Ὀλυμπιάς* Drachmann *πᾶ Ὀλύμπια* ms.) takes place in the eighth month.” The first

clause is sound and plain, and the second almost sound and equally plain, and they are interlocking. August as the eighth month is suitably *Apollōnios*, the month of the games when it was not *Parthenios*, since of all summer months August is most often named for festivals of Apollo. There is no reason to expect that the Eleian year and the Olympic cycle would begin with the summer solstice. When Syncellus, *Chron.* 368 says that the games are celebrated “at the beginning of the year,” he undoubtedly means the Athenian year, not the Eleian: see Ziehen, *RE* 18.1, 3, as against Samuel (1972, 96).

66. Again, the two extremes are clear:
τὰ μὲν ἀρχομέν<ης> τῆς ὁπώρας,

τὰ δὲ ὑπ’ αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀρκτοῦρον.

67. Miller (1974, 227–31) argues that all historical instances either point to the second full moon or can be reconciled with it, but he is refuted by Cicero’s exactly contemporary mention of the games in 44 B.C. (see note 69). Nor is it proven, as Miller affirms, that the games of 324, at which Nicanor read out Alexander’s exiles decree, came at the second full moon of 4 August. They could just as well have come at the third, on 2 September. Only the two cases of 480 and 44 B.C. are probative.

68. Such has long been the consensus, reargued by Miller (1974, 227–29). Sacks (1976), however, makes it the third full moon of 18 September, and some have since agreed, among them N. G. L. Hammond, *CAH*² 4.549–50. Sacks holds that the battle of Salamis in late September followed close on the battle of Thermopylae, as Herodotus might be taken to suggest when he speaks excitingly of the race of events. But activities of some duration come between: the advance by land and the siege of the Acropolis. Above all, the storm at Artemisium occurred at an unexpected time:

ἦν μὲν τῆς ὥρης μέσον θέρος “it was in point of season the middle of summer” (Hdt. 8.12.1). Despite Sacks (1976, 237–38), neither the unexpectedness nor this emphatic description can be reconciled with the third week of September.

69. Miller (1974, 230–31) combats this obvious inference in favor of the second full moon of 30 July, 44 B.C. Cicero, he observes, had thought long before of attending the games and had sailed from Pompeii about 17 July (in saying that Cicero could have reached Greece before 30 July, Miller forgets that the games would have started on 27 July). It was however on 17 August that Cicero fell in with persons at Velia who told him of the general opinion that he was then making for the games, *me existimari ad Olympia*. Had the games ended on 1 August, Cicero’s plans for them would no longer be a topic of discussion, and people from Italy who had attended would mostly have returned, with a full report.

70. Weniger (1905a, 21) gives a table of lunations for the years 777–768 B.C. In 776 the full moon closest to the solstice is 24 June; in 772—after fifty lunar months—9 July; in 668—after forty-nine lunar months—25 June. For the games to alternate between the Eleian months *Apollōnios* and *Parthenios*, it is only necessary that the second of three calendar months intercalated in each *oktaeteris* come in the fifth year, an Olympic year: Ziehen, *RE* 18.1, 2–3.

5

The Solstice Festival at Olympia

Synopsis

The Olympic truce is a terminus, together with the local festival *Kotytia*, for the agrarian ritual of column A. It is true that the wealthy of Selinus, as of other Dorian cities of the west, relied on this important institution when they traveled to Olympia in pursuit of sport and politics and trade. The tablet does not cater to the wealthy, however, but to lesser persons. Such persons enjoy the *Kotytia* but also know that the world at large enjoys the *Kronia*. This solstice festival marks the beginning of Olympia's Panhellenic truce. Though the festival name is not attested at Olympia—festival names are not well attested anywhere—we hear much of *Kronos* as the eponymous figure and something of the Mother as the deity to whom the festival was in fact addressed. More definite evidence is supplied by archaeology, in both the earliest built remains and the earliest votives on the north side of the Altis, right at the foot of the hill *Kronion*: this is the setting of the solstice festival. Elsewhere at Olympia, out of reach of excavation, the Mother was worshipped at her festival of spring, the *Galaxia* “milk rites.” The site is chiefly known from Pausanias’ account of the north side of *Kronion* but has been obscured by a corrupt text. The two festivals take place at two coordinate sites. So they do at Athens, where the Mother also gives her name to the city’s most famous landmark, the *Mêtrôon*. So they must have done in other Greek cities that kept up the old ways. The sanctuary we call “Olympia” first took this name when it was claimed for Olympian Zeus as the Mother’s triumphant son; before this the sacred area belonged to her alone. Here, at this painstakingly excavated site, the importance of the Mother must be judged above all by the material on the ground. The material has lately been reexamined, and the very ground has lately been reexcavated.

The Mother’s Temples

Ever since excavation began in 1875, the results have been scrutinized for evidence of conflict or reconciliation between Olympian Zeus and a different cult addressed to earlier powers—earlier in aetiological myth, and presumably in reality. The Olympic Games of late summer, though traditionally founded in 776 B.c., did not attract any perceptible attendance before about the second quarter of the seventh century, when wells were first dug round the stadium area.¹ Even if the list of Olympic victors is regarded as entirely authentic, it may still agree with this archaeological date—for it is possible or even likely that the four-year interval does not apply to the upper entries.² In any case, people came to worship much earlier, from the late tenth or the ninth century. But if Zeus was the object, they did not represent him in the way so common later, with thunderbolt in hand, or indeed in any way that we can recognize. The votive figurines will be considered below. Let us consider first the building history.

The large open area at the northwest of the Altis, labeled “Pelopion” because occupied in part by the precinct of Pelops, was tested by renewed excavation in the years 1987–1994.³ In 2002 it was announced by J. Rambach, the principal excavator, that the apsidal house VII, assigned by Dorpfeld and others to some more or less remote prehistoric date, is a large temple of c. 1000 B.C.⁴ When the stonework is properly distinguished, it is seen to be a much larger and solidier structure than formerly thought, upward of twenty m. long, perhaps much longer; the apse at the south is very large and deep; the building faces due north and is in fact aligned with the summit of the hill *Kronion*. All at once the building history of Olympia is carried back some four hundred years to the same time as the earliest votive material.

The temple of Hera, c. 600 B.C., was the next to be built. Apart from her temple and apart from its contents and customs as described by Pausanias, Hera is an evanescent figure at Olympia and is nearly unknown in the rest of Elis and Triphylia. It has therefore been suggested and argued plausibly from silence that the original occupant was not Hera but Zeus, who otherwise lacks accommodation of any kind until c. 470 B.C., when his famous temple on the south side of the Altis was put under construction.⁵ Title to the Archaic temple may have been transferred from Zeus to Hera in the later fifth century, on completion of the new temple.

Another temple, or rather a small *naiskos*, followed shortly, in c. 575 B.C.⁶ It was set down due east of the north side of Hera’s temple; its position is accordingly just outside the Altis as later defined, and close under the hill *Kronion*. East of it is the long row of treasuries; west of it the Nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus. The *naiskos* faces south toward the same open area as the apsidal building that faces north.

Inside is a base for a small cult image, protected or screened from view by a wooden barrier of some kind. A small circular altar was constructed in front, to be replaced with a larger one during the course of the sixth century. The *naiskos* and its altar were excavated long ago and variously identified—until A. Mallwitz showed beyond all doubt that they belong to the Mother.⁷

His demonstration relies in part on the fourth and last item of our building history, a small Classical temple built soon after 400 B.C. It is well known and belongs to the Mother. Now it stands a little to the east and to the south of the *naiskos*, at the very north edge of the Altis. It faces west—an unusual feature—in the direction of the *naiskos*, but of course its axis lies farther south and determines the exact site of the altar that was constructed at the same time. An altar is always the most sacrosanct and persistent location. But the very altar in front of the *naiskos* could no longer serve if the Mother was to have a new temple in the only space available, south of the treasuries. Otherwise the Classical temple plainly continues the same worship as the Archaic *naiskos*.

To Mallwitz's reasoning it can be added that the *naiskos*, with its interior base, is exactly what we expect of the Mother in the light of iconography and remains elsewhere. The Mother is quite generally depicted as sitting or standing in a *naiskos*.⁸ Furthermore, an undoubted *naiskos* of the Mother that is close in date and design to this one at Olympia has come to light at Acriae on the south coast of Laconia, east of the Eurotas mouth.⁹ J. de La Geniere followed the indications of Pausanias to the very site and recovered a few dispersed remains.

The earliest of our four temples, the apsidal building of c. 1000 B.C., waits to be assigned. Surely it is the Mother's. It faces the same open area as the Mother's *naiskos* and the Mother's temple. It once had its own altar, whether the traces disappeared in ancient times or in the early stages of excavation. The date at which it went out of use is not apparent. Yet the substantial wall footings were not removed or concealed, and still more of it may have survived, even the interior columns that can be postulated. Just in this area Pausanias came to a tottering wooden column that was ascribed to the house of Oenomaus, reputedly destroyed by lightning; he watched as excavators of the day turned up some ancient bronzes (5.20.6–8, 6.18.7).¹⁰

If this is right, we have three successive temples of the Mother, all focused on the same sacred area in front. The first temple was built at the time the site of Olympia was first occupied, at least by the Greeks. The reexcavation has disposed of any notion of a Mycenaean settlement; the site was left alone for perhaps a thousand years after a long-lived occupation in the Early and Middle Helladic periods.¹¹ The

three temples—the apsidal building, the *naiskos*, the Classical temple—span the entire history of Olympia. The same cannot be said of the cult sites of Zeus. The temple of Hera, whether it belonged at first to Zeus or his consort, is much later than the apsidal building, and so is the ash altar. Furthermore, temple and altar have not a single focus, and the great Classical temple is still farther off.¹²

The Mother's Votives

We turn to the early votive material. Nearly all of it that is earlier than the seventh century belongs to the so-called Black Layer of earth and ash and such debris. This was laid down to a variable depth over the whole area at the northwest. It represents exclusively the custom of Olympia before the innovations beginning with the temple of Hera. The earliest figurines of either terracotta or bronze, datable to the ninth and eighth centuries, depict a standing male with both arms raised in the “epiphany gesture,” naked but sometimes wearing cap or helmet. Thereafter, from the eighth to the sixth centuries, in the Black Layer and elsewhere, a long series of bronze statuettes made in different places and workshops again depict a standing male, naked but sometimes wearing helmet or belt and holding a spear with raised right arm and a shield with bent left arm.

All these are claimed for Zeus in authoritative publications, but the objections are very strong and have been growing.¹³ If not Zeus, who might they be? As a rendering of the worshippers, now in the attitude of prayer and now in fighting trim, they are no less peculiar.¹⁴ Instead, the second type seems very apt for certain deities who are prominent in Pausanias’ account of early Olympia and in other evidence to be adduced below: the mythical *Kuretes* as attendants of the Mother. They are thought of as armed dancers clashing spear and shield, a projection of the Mother’s tumultuous worship with cymbals and tambourines. The “epiphany gesture” of the first type might well be a more elementary rendering of the same mythical or ritual activity.

The most numerous figurines, both terracotta and bronze, with numbers increased by the recent excavation, are of animals: horses, oxen, and deer.¹⁵ These three species are the large animals that pasture on the plains of Elis and Triphylia; they belong to the pastoral background of the worshippers. Elsewhere in the area, notably at the site Kombothekra, similar figurines are offered to Artemis. At Olympia Artemis is not without honor, but she cannot be the object of the most frequent worship in the Altis.¹⁶ As for Zeus, he is not otherwise a patron of the pastoral life.¹⁷ It is the Mother—the “mountain Mother” situated often in upland pastures—to whom these figurines are suited

perfectly. Her shrine at Acraiae in Laconia is known for a terracotta offering unique to the site, a tubular object like a candelabrum with applique figures of goats, sheep, fowl, and birds.¹⁸ They represent the pastoral life of this upland area.

We would not dare to hope for a statue of the Mother to survive. Yet a remnant of one has just now been identified by the learning and acumen of U. Seidl.¹⁹ From a few fragments of bronze found in a well beside the stadium, she reconstructs the life-size statue of a Near Eastern goddess closely resembling Kubaba of Carchemish, datable to the later eighth century. It was a fragile work formed of bronze sheets over a wooden core, and must soon have suffered damage, for the surviving fragments, like some other bronze sheets of both Greek and Near Eastern workmanship, were reemployed in Greek *korai* of the seventh century. The original statue shows that the Mother was already, or more likely had always been, equated with the kindred goddesses of Anatolia and Syria.

The Tomb of Pelops

Besides Zeus and the Mother, Pelops is to the fore at Olympia (cf. Paus. 5.13.1).²⁰ He has a precinct of his own, within which is an apparent tomb, a landmark first mentioned by Pindar.²¹ The precinct is close by on the west, closest to the apsidal building. The tumulus is a very large one of the hardest clay, surrounded by a ring of fieldstones. Here then is another original constant element, like the series of the Mother's temples. But the Greeks who arrived in c. 1000 B.C. found it in place—it was part of the attraction of the site. As the reexcavation shows, the tumulus had been created in Early Helladic II (the clay contains potsherds) and then abandoned for some hundreds of years until occupation was resumed in Late Helladic III.²² For the Greeks, it became the tomb of a most ancient and illustrious hero.

Now Pelops has nothing to do with Zeus: anyone who partakes of the sacrifice to Pelops, a black ram, is barred from Zeus' temple (Paus. 5.13.3). Instead, he belongs wholly to the Mother. Among the various kinds of hero he is of the sacral or hieratic kind, being projected from the Mother's cult.²³ In a most transparent *aition* he is butchered and boiled for a cannibal feast and then put back together.²⁴ His ordeal is a mischievous deception practiced by his father on the whole company of gods, who have been invited to dinner. The setting of the story is Mount Sipylus, for early Greeks the most ancient seat of the ancient Mother of the Gods.²⁵ The dinner guests are her young, impetuous offspring. It is then an *aition*, an archetype of customary practice. It applies to any actual cult site of the Mother—such as Olympia—where she receives the offering of a black ram, personified

as the “dark-looking” hero (the literal meaning of $\Pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\psi < \sqrt{\pi\epsilon\lambda} + \sqrt{o\pi}$).²⁶

In c. 400 B.C. the dithyrambic poet Telestes of Selinus, who outlived his native city, tells how Pelops and his merry band brought the Mother’s music from mythical Phrygia and Lydia to actual “Peloponnesus” (PMG 810). By alluding thus to Mount Sipylus as the point of origin, he says in effect that Olympia is the Mother’s premier cult site in Greece. And he says so round the time that the Mother’s new Classical temple was constructed. Zeus is left aside. In 476 B.C., round the time that the great temple of Zeus was first proposed, Pindar tells how the much later hero Heracles came to Olympia to found the Olympic Games in Zeus’ honor and set up as well six altars of the Olympian gods and did so “beside the ancient tomb of Pelops” (Ol. 4.24–25).

The Mother’s Sanctuary on *Kronion*

The northwest sector of the Altis, with its three successive temples, is not the only area that is sacred to the Mother. Both Pindar and Pausanias refer to a different cult site—Pindar to the “Idaeian cave” (Ol. 5.18), which of course evokes the Mother (alias Rhea), and Pausanias to the temple of Eileithyia and Sosipolis (6.20.2–6), where the Mother and her offspring are masked by other names. Before its history was fully clarified, the *naiskos* at the foot of *Kronion* was sometimes equated with one or both of these items, quite wrongly.

Pindar, if it is he (for the authorship of Ol. 5 is much in doubt), invokes Zeus as “thou who dwell on the *Kronion* hill and who honor the broad-flowing Alpheios and the hallowed Idaeian cave.”²⁷ Obviously, an “Idaeian cave” was at the time, round 448 B.C., a landmark at Olympia: Demetrius of Scepsis, as cited by the scholiast, expressly distinguished such a cave “in Elis” from the famous ones in Crete and the Troad.²⁸ It must have been, to deserve the name, a mountain cave like the others; it was somewhere on the aforementioned “*Kronion* hill.” And since this cone-shaped mass of shifting sand does not admit of any natural cave, it was an artificial construction.²⁹ It may not have lasted very long, for Demetrius’ knowledge probably came from books. At the end of antiquity, when retaining walls and other fixtures were looted if they lent themselves to immediate reuse, the sand slid down *Kronion* freely to form deep layers on the north side of the Altis, so that ancient remains do not exist on the hill. Before this, nature must have brought many lesser changes.³⁰ And in 364 B.C. the Arcadians, with whatever disregard for “hallowed” ground, constructed a palisade round the hill and installed

a garrison (Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.14).

Pausanias' sanctuary of Eileithyia and Sosipolis, which commemorates the unexpected victory of the Eleians over the Arcadians—as does also a small shrine of Sosipolis in Elis town (6.25.4)—is described at the very end of his long account of the Altis and environs.³¹ The phrases that situate the sanctuary, though seemingly exact, are strangely confusing. He has just pointed to the hill *Kronion* “extending along the terrace and the treasures upon it,” and he has just described a ceremony at the summit (6.20.1). He

continues: *ἐν δὲ τοῖς πέρασιν*

τοῦ Κρονίου κατὰ τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἄρκτον ἔστιν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν θησαυρῶν καὶ τοῦ ὄρους

ἱερὸν Εἰλειθυίας “on the periphery of *Kronion* at the north side there is between the treasures and the hill a sanctuary of Eileithyia” (6.20.2). The phrase “between the treasures and the hill” is unambiguous. So the phrase “at the north side” has been made to

conform: *κατὰ τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἄρκτον vel <τείχος>*

(Bursian) *ἄλτεως> vel <τοῦ Ἡραίου> vel κατὰ τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἄλτιν* *<τῆς*

(C. Robert) “at the wall on the north” or “at the north side of the Altis” or “at the north side of the *Heraion*” or “at the side by the Altis.”³² Thus restored, Pausanias is taken to mean the *naiskos* beside the treasures.³³ And since the story and the ritual of Eileithyia and Sosipolis are undoubtedly appropriate to the Mother (as we shall see in a moment), the *naiskos* is also identified with the Idaean cave.

There are fatal objections. Mallwitz confirmed what Dorpfeld and others suspected, that the *naiskos* was no longer visible in Pausanias' day. Nor does it match his description of a “temple” with two substantial chambers, inner and outer, reserved for Sosipolis and Eileithyia respectively. Nor was it ever suitable in appearance or position for the title of “Idaean cave.” Above all, Pausanias' location has been misconceived. The text cannot be remedied by such supplements as we have seen. The phrase “between the treasures and the hill” is a persisting problem. It supersedes the others. Pausanias did not need to say “on the periphery of *Kronion* at the north side” with whatever supplement. And this sanctuary seems to belong squarely within his account of the Altis and environs; he should not have distracted us with special mention of *Kronion* and of a ceremony on the summit. Surely that phrase must go. It is a gloss added by an officious but misguided reader and then incorporated in the text. Without it, the language and the sequence are straightforward. After the ceremony on the summit, Pausanias points to a site on the north side of *Kronion*, well away from the Altis and the treasures.³⁴

C. Robert was therefore wrong to equate Pausanias' sanctuary

with the *naiskos*. But his interpretation of this sanctuary—of the deities, the ritual, the foundation story—was learned and acute and is rightly accepted by those who have reconsidered the matter.³⁵

When Eleians and Arcadians faced each other on the battlefield, says Pausanias, a woman appeared to the Eleians suckling a newborn babe and offered it as the champion ordained by a dream. The babe was set in front of the army, and changed into a snake, and brought a great victory by reason of the fear it inspired among the Arcadians. It was accordingly called Sosipolis “Savior of the city,” and where it afterward vanished into the ground a sanctuary was built for it and for Eileithyia, goddess of childbirth. Eileithyia is worshipped at her festival by women and maidens who sing hymns and who burn cakes, but pour no wine, on the altar in the outer chamber. Sosipolis as a “local power,” *epichorios daimon*, is thought to dwell in the inner chamber, but only the old woman chosen as priestess at each festival, veiled in white, goes inside to offer bathwater and honey cakes.

Obviously, we cannot believe that the battle happened so, and hence that the sanctuary and the festival so originated.³⁶ We must ask where they really came from. Sanctuary and festival belong to a nurturing goddess as the principal figure. The name Eileithyia will be secondary since this goddess of ancient renown and Cretan allure is not elsewhere joined with an imaginary infant. The infant is just like Zeus, both in taking snake form and in being called “Sosipolis.” The ritual, with honey cakes and bathwater, is just like the Mother’s. The sanctuary setting, on the periphery of the hill *Kronion*, suits the Mother. Elsewhere at Olympia the worship of the Mother continued without change after the events of 364 B.C. There is however a compelling reason why the victorious Eleians should fix on some age-old cult and reinvent it. The Pisatans, who were generally allowed to be the original denizens of Olympia, had joined the Arcadians (Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.28–29, etc.). The Eleians needed to show that local powers were on *their* side.

Furthermore, Pausanias’ sanctuary on the periphery of *Kronion*, with its inner chamber where an imaginary infant was washed and fed, cannot be unrelated to Pindar’s “Idaeian cave” (where the infant Zeus was washed and fed), for which the only feasible location is on the hill. Pausanias’ sanctuary was no doubt on the lowest slope, “the periphery.” Perhaps that was enough for a reputed mountain cave, or perhaps in early days higher ground was unwisely chosen for a more picturesque effect, and was relinquished later, to be succeeded by Pausanias’ sanctuary.

Another piece of ritual belongs to this sanctuary. Pausanias comes to it after pointing to the hill *Kronion* as a prominent feature and after describing a ceremony on its summit. This is a sacrifice to the eponym

Kronos at the spring equinox in the month *Elaphios* = March. In Ionia March is sometimes called *Galaxion* after the Mother's festival *Galaxia*. At Athens, where the festival is well attested as the occasion of official sacrifices, we also hear of a private sacrifice to *Kronos* just at midmonth, on the fifteenth of *Elaphêboliôn* = March.³⁷ The monthly date, we may assume, is meant to approximate the equinox. For the *Galaxia* as for the truce, Olympia keeps the original solar reckoning. It may well be that the summer festival *Kronia* was also signalized by sacrifice on the summit of *Kronion*. As was said, the apsidal temple in the Altis is aligned exactly with the summit.

The Pattern of the Mother's Worship

Here then are the principal traces of the Mother at Olympia. She has two longlived cult sites on opposite sides of *Kronion*—at the south foot and somewhere on the north side. The former is familiar as the most ancient excavated area. It is now seen to be defined by successive temples of the Mother, the Protogeometric building of c. 1000 B.C., the Archaic *naiskos* of c. 575, and the Classical temple of c. 400. Beside the earliest temple is the preexisting mound of the hero Pelops, an auxiliary of the Mother. The Mother's votives are thickly strewn in the Black Layer that was laid down over the whole area. The site on the north side is known only from literature. Pindar and Demetrius of Scepsis speak of it as "the Idaean cave"; Pausanias describes a double-chambered temple of Eileithyia and Sosipolis, names conferred by the Eleians in 364 B.C. In connexion with this temple he reports a ceremony on the summit of *Kronion* that belongs to the festival *Galaxia*.

Other traces may be briefly catalogued for the sake of completeness. Pausanias comes to an altar of "the Mother of the gods" in his separate enumeration of altars at Olympia (5.14.5–15.9, at 14.9), which follows neither the topographic order of his tour of Olympia nor the chronological order in which the altars (or some of them) might be visited in any calendar year, but rather the topographic and chronological order of an unusual monthly circuit conducted by the Eleians (as explained at 5.14.4, 6, 10, 15.10–12).³⁸ The circuit was plainly for the benefit of visitors to the games; these altars are all assignable to the Altis and environs and to the stadium, hippodrome, and gymnasium. So the Mother's altar separately mentioned ought to be the altar of the *Metreon*. Herodorus of Heracleia, c. 400 B.C., alleged a double altar of *Kronos* and Rhea among those set up by Heracles to make a *dodekatheon* (FGrH 31 F 34a). Of the other five, three are certainly, two very probably, included in Pausanias' circuit.³⁹ So the alleged altar of *Kronos* and

Rhea ought likewise to be the altar of the *Metroon*.

Heracles as leader of the *Kurêtes* (vying predictably with the son of Alcmena) has an altar mentioned in the circuit shortly after the Mother's altar and said to be "near the treasury of the Sicyonians," the westernmost on the terrace (Paus. 5.14.9)—which locates it fairly near the altar of the *Mêtrôon*. This altar of the leading *Kurês*, as we may call him, is distinct from a group of five altars belonging to the band of *Kurêtes* under their individual names—Heracles alias *Parastates*, *Epimedes*, Idas alias *Akesidas*, *Paionios*, *Iasos*—mentioned earlier in the circuit (5.14.7). Though not expressly situated, they come among a long series of altars associated with the temple and statue of Zeus, and the house of Oenomaus, and the ash altar of Zeus (14.4–8 *init.*). They stood somewhere farther south in the Altis. As others have remarked, the five individual names are all expressive of healing and personal solace or deliverance.⁴⁰ *Kuretes* or *Korybantes* in general came to be regarded in this light, but it was a later development.⁴¹

If the Mother's importance is solidly demonstrated by the monuments, it is vividly asserted by the legendary history of Olympia that Pausanias drew from some late, all-conciliating source (5.7.6–8.5, cf. 8.2.2). When *Kronos* ruled in heaven, he was worshipped at Olympia in a temple constructed by the Golden Race. Still at Olympia, the infant Zeus was entrusted by Rhea to the *Kuretes*, who had come here from Crete, being known also as "Idaeon *Daktyloi*," with "Idaeon Heracles" among them. They are commemorated by those altars, but the factitious "Idaeon cave" has dropped out of the story.⁴² They ran the first Olympic footrace, taking the olive crown from the olive boughs on which they used to sleep. And then Zeus wrestled down *Kronos* or staged a set of games among the emergent Olympian gods. All this goes back to such early days that in the long interval before 776 B.C. the games were celebrated repeatedly, just after the flood and when Pelops arrived in Greece and several more times. For Telestes of Selinus, Pelops' arrival was also the beginning of the Mother's worship.

No other territory where the Mother was worshipped from of old at characteristic sanctuaries is known as well as Olympia, not by a wide margin. At Athens, however, though the ground in question has been so trodden and transformed as to efface the physical remains, we have a written record. Here, in the oldest sector of the city at the southeast, the Mother has two distinct cult sites, just as at Olympia.⁴³ As at Olympia, a temple of Zeus *olympios* was built next to one of them, the so-called *Kronion* precinct, with its own temple of *Kronos* and Rhea. The other was adjacent, as it is not at Olympia, on the far bank of the Ilissus, under the name of *Meter*, or the *Metroon*, in *Agra*. In everchanging Athens, this southeast sector on either side of the

Ilissus presently declined. But when the Classical Agora was marked out at the northwest, perhaps the first building, and afterwards the most famous one in Athens, far surpassing any on the Acropolis, was another *Metreon*.⁴⁴

At Olympia it can be seen, and elsewhere it is to be inferred, that the Mother's two characteristic sanctuaries correspond to her two great festivals, the *Galaxia* of spring and the *Kronia* of summer, more exactly the spring equinox and the summer solstice. The *Galaxia* rites north of *Kronion* and on its summit are associated as usual with the birth and nursing of Zeus, so that the "Idaeian cave" is located hereabouts, and the Eleians neatly substitute their own marvelous child. But the summer festival *Kronia* is far more popular, and the remains south of *Kronion* (temples and altars and votives) are far more prominent.

Olympian Zeus

The Olympic Games first come to view in the early seventh century, with the construction of wells. Votives that undoubtedly belong to Zeus first appear about the same time. This may well be the time, rather than 776 B.C., that suits the first entries in the victor list and is also the time for a final Pisatan interlude that was always acknowledged. Thereafter Olympia is known for a different festival, the games of Zeus in late summer. They are called Ὀλομπία [ἱερο] "Olympian [rites]" after the mythical victory of a new regime in heaven, recently proclaimed in Hesiod's *Theogony* (c. 700 B.C.). The new and final regime of the Greek succession story conforms to the epic picture of Zeus *Olympios* and the *Olympia domata* in which he holds council with other gods.⁴⁵ Other instances of the festival ὄλομπια and the cult epithet ὄλομπιος are plainly secondary.⁴⁶ And the place name ὄλνμποα is likewise due to the festival name.⁴⁷ Before this, the sanctuary was perhaps known only as "Pisa," the name of the district (there was never a town or other site so called).⁴⁸

We should pause to consider Hesiod's procedure and its relevance to Olympia. Pelops will guide us. As was explained above, this hero embodies the black ram that is sacrificed at the festival of the Mother of the Gods. It is her festival of spring, the *Galaxia* "Milk rites," when the Mother's offspring are being nurtured. The company of gods, says the story, were once induced by a trick, or nearly were, to dine on the flesh of the "dark-looking" hero, whence the actual sacrifice, with whatever mysterious rules for distributing the portions. The story is extravagant, but such is the spirit of the Mother's worship.

Hesiod knew an alternative story, just as extravagant. The setting is another mountain where the Mother was worshipped from of old,

on the island of Crete.⁴⁹ But here the company of gods are themselves, as mere infants, devoured by a frightful father, the Mother's spouse. He is called *Kronos* after the Mother's other festival, the *Kronia*—though the eponym is otherwise a genial person, dispenser of a Golden Age, inasmuch as the summer festival is merry. *Kronos* has these two conflicting characters throughout Greek literature, but Hesiod insisted on the frightful one. He did so while constructing his own version of the Succession in Heaven, in which the whole previous regime is frightful.

I put it thus to show the common folktale background of the two stories, without meaning to belittle Hesiod's achievement. He gave new authority to the traditional picture of Zeus. At Olympia, he caused Zeus to be taken up as the Mother's triumphant son. Greek literature when it suddenly arose had a sharp effect on ordinary life, including the worship of the gods and the heroes. Not so long after this transformation of Pisa, Eleusis was transformed by the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*, with a story that brilliantly combines the cult myths of Demeter and of Persephone. We would not expect the new outlook to bring any sudden monumental change.⁵⁰ The temple of Hera, arguably meant for Zeus and in any case witness to his presence, is no earlier than c. 600 B.C. Immediately after, the Mother herself was treated to a new *naiskos* in the contemporary style.

A Good Time for All

The Olympic truce, however, was created at once. It is a means of showing how the new dispensation succeeds the old. The truce begins at the summer solstice, the age-old signal for the Mother's festival *Kronia*, and determines the moment when Greeks everywhere will assemble for Zeus' victory games. In the early seventh century, just as later, the festival was doubtless celebrated in each Greek city according to a local calendar of months—but only thus and with the aid of heralds could the time be synchronized. An inscribed "disk" announcing the truce was kept in the temple of Hera among the oldest objects suitable for display; it was old enough to be obscure and controversial then and now.⁵¹ Thereafter the disk shape was commonly used for bronze documents posted in the Altis.⁵² If the shape has any particular significance, it is likely to be a solar disk evoking the solstice.

Down to the fifth century, the truce and the solstice festival were synonymous, as in the Selinus tablet. At Selinus and other Dorian cities of Sicily the *Kronia* are evidently replaced by the *Kotytia*, a festival of merry license occurring at the same time. Even then, in c. 450, and even later, the Mother's worship was well maintained at

Olympia, as we see from Pindar, from Telestes of Selinus, and from the construction of her Classical temple and altar. As a leading feature of her worship, Telestes singles out the *krater* drink that was later much favored in private initiation rites derived from the public worship.⁵³

Long before the beginning of Greek literature, the *Kronia* suggested the picture of a Golden Age under an imaginary eponym *Kronos*. Hesiod was able to construct a suitable succession of divine regimes only by suppressing the Golden Age and by opening the story of man with the unfortunate picnic at *Mekone* that can be recognized as the spring festival of Zeus *milichios* (*Theog.* 535–60). The festival *Kronia* was itself proverbial; it was a byword matched only by the Roman *Saturnalia*; they were equated, though marking the opposite solstices. Xenophon and Aristotle speak fondly of a summer festival extending to slaves and representing the most ancient social gathering (*Oec.* 5.10, *Eth. Nic.* 8.9.11, 1160 a 23–28).⁵⁴ Philochorus dilates on the fellowship of masters and slaves at Athens' *Kronia* (*FGrH* 328 F 97). Long after, Plutarch regards the *Kronia*, like the country *Dionysia*, as a mere festival of slaves (*Nonposse suaviter vivi* 16, 1098B).⁵⁵ He disapproves of such a thing, whereas others had taken a more genial view. In an age when old festivals were conducted, if at all, with tired punctilio, the noise and tumult of the *Kronia* seemed to exemplify the unabashed pleasure principle.

1. Mallwitz (1988, 97–99), cf. Serwint (1993, 405–6).

2. The early Olympic dates are generally accepted, but for convenience, not because they have been vindicated. N. G. L. Hammond, *CAH2* 3.3.321–25, argues for them; so did H. T. Wade-Gery in *CAH1*. The state of the question is however as indicated by Jacoby, *FGrHIIB* Kommentar 1.223–28, 2.147–54 (§XVIII Elis and Olympia). For the view that the list is authentic with shorter intervals at first, see Wilamowitz (1922, 483–90), E. Meyer, *RE* 20.2 (1950, 1747–53) s.vv. Pisa, Pisatis. It is discounted by Jacoby, *FGrH* IIIb Kommentar 2.153–54, as imponderable, and by Bengtson (1988, 396) as subjective, and they are not wrong. Strictly speaking, the upper reaches of the victors' list should be discarded in favor of the archaeological evidence.

3. Kyrieleis (2002), Rambach (2002b) (prehistoric remains).

4. Rambach (2002a), cf. Rambach (2002b, 209nn62–63); Moustaka (2002b, 314n76). 70 at Selinus, rules throughout the year

5. Moustaka (2002a, 2002b).

6. Mallwitz (1972, 92, 97, 155–63).

7. Former identifications include the Mother (so, and very notably, C. Robert, in the matter of Eileithyia and Sosipolis to be discussed below). Only Hampe (1952, 340–50) refuses to regard it as a place of worship and makes it a miniscule treasury that must have gone out of use almost at once, before the altars were constructed in front.

8. See Naumann (1983, 110–49, pls. 12–21) (Archaic instances, to be followed by many later ones).

9. See de La Genie`re (1992, 99–102), citing also her previous studies of the

material.

10. That the ruins of the apsidal temple became the house of Oenomaus is proposed by Rambach (2002a, 132–34). I come back to the house of Oenomaus and the lightning in [chapter 15](#), p. 238.

11. Kyrieleis (2002, 216–19).

12. That huge altar of cemented ash was “equidistant from the precinct of Pelops and the shrine of Hera but situated nonetheless in front of both,” says Pausanias with seeming, yet baffling, precision (5.13.8). No trace of it was ever found, perhaps because it was obliterated by Christians in late antiquity (for wishful thoughts of long ago see Frazer *ad loc.*). Mallwitz (1972, 78, fig. 70, 84–85) gives a conjectural location that has no particular likelihood. Rambach (2002a, 131–32) suggests that the ash altar belonged at first to the apsidal temple—but then Zeus should always have retained the temple site, as well as the altar. He further suggests that the destruction and leveling of the apsidal temple took place just before the Black Layer was laid down, being connected with it in a general reorganization—but this is much too hypothetical.

13. The identification as Zeus, proposed by E. Kunze and W. D. Heilmeyer, is accepted by Mallwitz (1972, 20–22), Schwabl, *RESuppl.* 15 (1978) 1096 s. Zeus, and Morgan (1990, 26). It is opposed by E. Simon, *RESuppl.* 15 (1978) 1419–20 s. Zeus, M. Tiverios, *LIMC* 8 (1997) Zeus nos. 7–8, and Himmelmann (2002, 95–102).

14. Himmelmann (2002) takes them as worshippers, while arguing that such votives are meant to display wealth and status rather than to flatter the deity.

15. Morgan (1990, 7, 33–34, 38, 90–91), Kyrieleis (2002, 216, 218–19).

16. Sinn (1981, 40–43) supposes that the cult of Artemis flourished here in early days.

17. Morgan (1990, 26–28) thinks of early sanctuaries of Zeus as located “in marginal areas,” “in remote or peak sites,” in a “rustic setting,” so that animal figurines are a suitable offering. Schachter (1990, 42–43) in a similar vein characterizes Zeus as “a country man’s god,” whose “major sanctuaries” are “in the country, on mountaintops and at the bases of mountains.” But the mountain sites that Morgan and Schachter emphasize, quite reasonably as long as they are not described as rustic, are in contrast, not agreement, with Olympia.

18. See de La Geniere (1992, 101). She suggests two possible uses, either for holding torches at a nocturnal revel or for pouring libation.

19. Seidl (2007, 232–41).

20. “The Eleians honor Pelops as far above all the other heroes of Olympia as they honor Zeus above the other gods.”

21. For a full account, see Mallwitz (1972, 134–37; 1988, 86–87, 101–3).

22. Kyrieleis (2002, 215–16, 218–19), Rambach (2002b, 180–86, 189–94, 198).

23. That Pelops is of such a kind is perhaps generally agreed: see e.g. Burkert (1972a, 109–19). But the cult has not been recognized as the Mother’s.

24. The story happens to be first attested in the fifth century, though it is implied by the epic *Nostoi*: see Gantz (1993, 531–36). It is as old as it is famous.

25. The historical worship continues that of the Bronze Age: Cadoux (1938, 25–26, 35–36, 39–40, 21518), Naumann (1983, 20–22). Here too we find Niobe, a mother weeping for her children—the Mother and her brood of godlings in yet another guise.

26. This is P. Kretschmer’s etymology of *Πελοψ*, an obvious one, though branded by Frisk, *GEW* s. *πελιδνός* as “quite uncertain” and passed over by Chantraine. *DELG* s. *πελιδνός*. *√πελ* mostly appears as *πελι-*, but the shorter form is seen in *πελαργός*, *πέλεια*, and perhaps other words.

27. *Ol.* 5, which celebrates the same victory as *Ol.* 4, was not accepted as Pindar’s in some ancient editions or commentaries; it was rejected by Wilamowitz

(1922, 420–23).

28. Hampe (1952, 336–40), followed by Herrmann (1962, 8), dismisses Demetrius and holds that Pindar means the famous Idaean cave of Crete. The Alpheius alone, he rightly says, often stands for Olympia in Pindar and Bacchylides; he infers that the Idaean cave mentioned next must be somewhere else. He does not however remark, much less explain, the “*Kronion* hill” as the first item of a threefold invocation, continuing with the Alpheius and the Idaean cave.

29. So Weniger (1907, 155–57). To remove all doubt, R. Menge tested the ground in 1890 at Weniger’s request and reported, “Sandstone, virtually sand, fine, but toughly cohering; no existent grotto formation, only possible artificially.”

30. Cf. Weniger (1907, 156) and Hampe (1952, 349).

31. Thereafter he turns to the stadium, the hippodrome, the gymnasium, and the tomb of Oenomaus beyond the Cladeus (6.20.8–21.2). It is true that he comes back to the *hippodamion* once more (6.20.7, cf. 5.22.2). Perhaps it was right beside the stadium entrance (6.20.8). This solution is however rejected by Mallwitz (1972, 10, 83–84, 93, 245), who discusses the several related problems.

32. Cf. Hitzig and Blümner *ad loc.*, Frazer (vol. 1, 589).

33. Robert (1893), Weniger (1907, 162–64), Wilamowitz (1922, 210), J. Schmidt, *RE* 3A 1 (1927) 1169 s. Sopolis 2, and finally Herrmann (1962, 7–10)—even while noting Dorpfeld’s objection that the *naiskos* was buried long before Pausanias.

34. Ziehen, *RE* 18.1 (1939) 56 s. Olympia, without discussing the text (except to say that it is “not quite clear”), holds as I do that the sanctuary must be sought to the north of *Kronion*.

35. So Weniger (1907, 157–62), Wilamowitz (1922, 214–15; 1931, 132), Schmidt, *RE* 3A 1, 1171–72, Ziehen, *RE* 18.1, 54–56. Herrmann (1962, 6–7) begs to differ and speaks rather of “a mother goddess with child, worshipped here since time immemorial”: surely a distinction without a difference. Note, however, that Robert attributed the partisan story to a much earlier clash between Eleians and Arcadians, a needless refinement.

36. It is true that this story of a woman, a baby, and a snake belongs to the general type of “the unlikely savior,” which the Greeks used to reaffirm the social order: so Kearns (1990, 323, 325–26). But the story type does not explain the narrative details, much less the corresponding shrine and ritual.

37. Robertson (1996a, 241–45).

38. On the monthly circuit see Ziehen, *RE* 18.1, 48–50, citing *inter alia* Weniger’s extensive studies. Hölscher (2002, 336, 344) in brief compass adds important observations.

39. Hermes and Apollo, *Charites* and Dionysus, Artemis and Alpheius are signaled by Pausanias somewhere on the west side of the Altis (5.14.8, 14.10, 14.6, respectively). Zeus and Poseidon are by general consent restored near the beginning of the circuit in an undoubted lacuna (14.4, cf. 24.1). Hera and Athena it is reasonable to equate with Athena *seule*, mentioned shortly after the ash altar of Hera, which was presumably in front of her temple and just before the Mother of the Gods (14.8–9).

40. Usener (1895, 155–61), Weniger (1907, 172–75).

41. For the *Korybantes* as healers see Dodds (1951, 77–80), after Linforth.

42. In the *archaiologia* we seem to hear of a single altar serving all five (5.8.1), but of separate altars in the tour (14.7). The tour is to be preferred as giving more detail, though even here Pausanias has sacrificed clarity to his affectedly flowing style.

43. Robertson (1996a, 274–77; 2005, 50–52) and [chapter 8](#), pp. 135–37.

44. It has long been held that before the mid Hellenistic period, when a larger

Metroon was constructed with a different plan, its predecessor on the site was a disused Council House facing south, somehow tantamount to a *Metroon*. Yet Miller (1995) demonstrates that this too was a temple facing east, in which the flanking aisles must have served as archives, a traditional concern. Shear (1995) is opposed, but his valuable survey of the cult history (171–78) seems to me support Miller's interpretation better than his own. Others however would leave the question open: Raaflaub (1998, 94), Immerwahr (2005, 100–1).

45. The epic picture is fully described by Nilsson (1932b, 228–38). It is due in part to Zeus' role as weather god and to the typical mountain name "Olympos"; here it conflicts with the real-life notion of other gods as inhabiting various parts of nature. We now see that it is ultimately based on a traditional paradigm of divine government in the Near East—a mountaintop assembly—prevailing chronologically and geographically from Sumer to Canaan. Whether it reached Greece in the Mycenaean or the Orientalizing period can be debated; the former is far likelier, as shown by G. S. Kirk on *Iliad* bks. 5–8 (1990, 4–7). If it did so, it in part reflects Mycenaean government and society, as Nilsson (1932b, 238–51) argued just as reasonably. The paradigm reflects government and society throughout the Bronze Age. Against this large background, the festival and the cult site "Olympia" are all the more novel and peculiar.

46. For these instances see Ziehen, *RE* 18.1, 45–47.

47. The locative *Ὀλυμπίασι* must be as old as any record of victors at the games; the locatives for other games, such as *Πυθῶι, Ἰσθμῶι, Νεμέαι*, follow by analogy. This one however is formed not from the place *Ὀλυμπία* (the locative would be *Ὀλυμπίαι*) but from the festival *Ὀλύμπια*. It is an old "temporal" locative like **Δίασι* (< *Δία*, > *Διάσια*, *Διάσιον*) "at the Zeus-rites," i.e. "at Carnival" (cf. chapter 9, p. 144), and was doubtless used by analogy with it. The place name Olympia is therefore secondary.

48. On the fluctuating use of "Pisa," "Pisatis," see Meyer, *RE* 20.2, 1733–47.

49. For the site, the cave of Cretan Ida, see Sporn (2002, 218–23). The votive material is distinctive of the festival *Galaxia*: Robertson (1996a, 246–53).

50. It may well be that the six altars of Pindar (and of Herodorus *FGrH* 31 F 34a–b, adduced by the scholiast) were the earliest tribute to the Olympian regime. Ziehen, *RE* 18.1, 49, 54, discounts them as others have done because the twelvefold count of Olympian gods is not an early belief. It is however essential to Hesiod's story of the Succession in Heaven.

51. Cf. Ziehen, *RE* 17.2 (1937) 2525–27 s. Olympia.

52. See Siewert (2002, 360–63).

53. *πρῶτοι παρὰ κρατήρας Ἑλλάνων*, he begins, did Pelops' merry band introduce the Mother's worship (*PMG* fr. 810 line 1). The *krater* drink, probably honey and milk, is emblematic of the Mother's worship and of mysteries derived from it down to the end of antiquity. It is expressly mentioned, as *κρατηρίζω / κρατηρισμός*, at Athens in 330 B.C., as one of Aeschines' ministrations beside his priestess mother (Dem. 18 *De cor.* 259), and at Erythrae, c. 200 B.C., where it is somehow coordinate with the ritual bath adduced before (*IvErythrai* 206 lines 6–12). It is also held up as the Mother's gift to initiates in an epigram at her public shrine at Phaestus, third century (ICr I xxiii 3 line 2, *τοῖς ὁσίοις κίχρητι* "for the holy she mixes," scil. the drink), and is depicted in a votive relief at her Peiraeus shrine, c. 300 B.C., as her gesture of proffering a trefoil jug to the seated Attis (Berlin, Staat. Mus. inv. 1612, the date after e.g. Simon, *LIMC* 8 [1997] Kybele 22: the gesture cannot possibly derive from the iconography of Bronze Age Anatolia, a recent suggestion), and is probably the ritual use to be attributed to the Spina *krater* illustrating the Mother's festival, 440–420 B.C. (Ferrara 2897, the date after e.g. Simon, *LIMC* Kybele 66). Allusions begin with Plato, Tim.

41d, *Phil.* 61b-c, unless with Antimachus fr. 20 Wyss / 21 Matthews lines 2–3.

54.

τίς δέ ἄλλη (scil. ἡ γῆ) θεοῖς ἀπαρχὰς πρῶταυθεντέρας παρέχει ἢ ἑορτὰς πληρεστέρας ἀποδεδεικνύει; τίς δέ οἰκέταις προσηυλέστερα κτλ. (Xenophon). αἱ γὰρ ὀρχοῦσαι θυσίαι καὶ σπένδοι καίνονται γίνεσθαι μετὰ τὰς τῶν καρπῶν

συγκομιδὰς οἷον ἀπαρχαί· μάλιστα γὰρ ἐν τούτοις ἐσχόλαζον τοῖς καιροῖς (Aristotle). These are usually taken as harvest festivals. But neither the grain harvest nor the vintage was itself the occasion for a large festival of general good cheer, and Aristotle plainly means a festival *after* the grain harvest, at an *idle* time.

55. Bomer (1961, 415–37) treats the *Kronia*, *Saturnalia*, and *Compitalia* all together in relationship to slaves, but he recognizes that this is in each case a secondary development.

Zeus *Eumenês* and the *Eumenides*

Synopsis

Column A, lines 8–9:

To Zeus *eumenês* and the *Eumenides* sacrifice a full-grown animal.

The ritual of column A unfolds in chronological order, from early spring to early summer. The first observance is a festival of Zeus *eumenês* and the *Eumenides*, the former unfamiliar—a father figure, we may suppose—but the latter a female group of wide renown in literature and art. As much as any ritual element, the *Eumenides* have imposed the view that the tablet deals with the outcome of murderous civil strife. But the evidence of cult, which is now considerable, is at variance with that of literature and art. The *Eumenides* prove to be agrarian deities dwelling in the earth beside streams and springs, fostering new growth, likened to snakes emerging in spring, summoned by worshippers with emblematic sprays of flowers, entreated especially by women. This old Dorian worship was carried abroad from the Peloponnesus to Dorian states as far flung as Rhodes and Cyrene. It was probably with reference to the cult at Tiryns that the *Eumenides* were first equated with the terrible *Erinyes* of epic tradition. And it was no doubt in Sicily and south Italy that they were first taken up in Orphic texts, which give a truer picture than mainstream literature because Orphic practitioners were fundamentalists intent on maintaining old ways. In late poetry reproducing Orphic views the *Eumenides* dwell beneath the earth as offspring of Zeus *chthonios* and Persephone—and as in early cult they “work with flowers.” Conversely, in early cult the father is Zeus *eumenês* or Zeus with some other title. Orphic texts also speak of Apollo as the destined father, a seeming paradox; it is because Persephone was destined to rule in the upper world according to Zeus’ original design. The promised queenship of Persephone is another notable feature of early cult, attested at Selinus by the title *Pasikrateia*.

Chronological Order

A few words are needed first about all the sacrifices of column A, to be performed before the solstice celebration. The sacrifices are grouped according to the gods who receive them, the gods being mentioned first, in the dative: (1) to Zeus *eumenês* and the *Eumenides*, sacrifice a full-grown animal (lines 8–9); (2) to Zeus *milichios* in [the land] of *Myskos*, sacrifice a full-grown animal (line 9); (3) to *Tritopatreis* who are foul, [sacrifice some animal] (lines 9–13), “and then” to those who are pure, sacrifice a full-grown animal and set out table offerings and burn them (lines 13–17); and (4) to [Zeus] *milichios* in [the land] of *Euthydamos*, sacrifice a ram and set out table offerings or sacrifice any customary victim at home (lines 17–24). Apart from this recurring syntax, no organizing principle can be discerned.

To group sacrifices according to recipients in the dative is the style of the commonest documentary form concerned with rules for ritual, so-called calendars of sacrifice. They are “calendars” because the rules are arranged in strict chronological order: it is the only feasible arrangement. The scope of the rules will vary greatly, but a basic rule, sometimes the only one, is what animals, and of what value, are to be sacrificed. The tablet shows the same concern with animal victims and also with their value, though it is only roughly indicated. No matter what the immediate need addressed by the tablet, it would seem natural to arrange these rules in chronological order.

The assumption is borne out by what we already know of the deities in question. The *Eumenides* are worshipped in early spring at several places and, at nearby Entella, give their name to such a month. Zeus *milichios* is known for his festival of *Anthesterion* = February. The *Tritopatreis* are firmly tied to late spring and early summer in Attic calendars. Zeus *milichios* is also known for a sacrifice at Athens in *Hekatombaion* = July. So the chronological evidence that lies to hand agrees remarkably with the order of column A.

The same evidence also explains a striking disparity between the several items. Items (1) and (2) are of the briefest. A line and a half suffices for both together, without any detail, even though the full-grown animals are of comparable value to those prescribed hereafter: they will be sacrificed with comparable ceremony. By contrast, items (3) and (4) each take up eight lines of meticulous detail. The mode of sacrifice, the various offerings and how to display them, the final burning up and even the smearing over of ashes, are all set forth as if for the first time. Why is this?

A simple reason can be suggested. If items (1) and (2) belong to

public festivals, the whole procedure will be obvious and predetermined. If items (3) and (4) are private undertakings, a person who is merely told to sacrifice will not know exactly how to do it. As we find them elsewhere, both the *Eumenides* of item (1) and Zeus *milichios* of item (2) have festivals in early spring. On the other hand, the *Tritopatreis* of item (3) have no festival that we ever hear of; Attic calendars give various dates within the same season. Zeus *milichios* of item (4) evokes a private occasion at Athens, albeit a legendary one, when Theseus is received at home by the *genos* Phytalidae. It may be added that item (4) expressly includes a sacrifice at home.

Zeus *Eumenês*

We turn now to the first item, the worship of Zeus *eumenês* and the *Eumenides*. The worship of the *Eumenides*, if not of Zeus *eumenês*, is better known at other Dorian cities, both in the west and in the Peloponnesus. Almost any custom is best known at Athens, where we find the corresponding worship of the *Semnai Theai*, to be considered in the next chapter.

A full-grown animal is sacrificed to both Zeus *eumenês* and the *Eumenides*.¹ The *Eumenides*, they “Of-good-will”, are known as goddesses of cult elsewhere. Zeus *eumenês*, likewise “of-good-will,” is not a partner elsewhere, and other occurrences are unrelated to ours. At Lydian Philadelphia, in the rules of a private cult association, Zeus *eumenês* comes first in a long string of deities of outstanding goodness, mostly personifications (*SIG*³ 985 / *LSAM* 20 lines 6–7).² At Carian Tralles, Zeus of Larasa as the principal civic deity appears, in just a few documents, with the additional title *eumenês*. Since Philadelphia was founded, and Tralles was subsequently ruled, by kings of Pergamum with the recurring name *Eumenês*, the epithet must have expressed a political feeling as well.³ In these cases Zeus *eumenês* is not a traditional figure, and he is otherwise unheard of.⁴ The adjective was too ordinary, and too generally used as the ordinary name *Eumenês*, to serve as a divine epithet.⁵

Apart from this very epithet, Zeus and the *Eumenides* are found together in two other cults surviving in our spotty record. At Cyrene it is Zeus with or without the epithet *melichios*; on Chios it is simply Zeus. The cults at both places will derive from the Dorian Peloponnesus, where the *Eumenides* are at home. From the Peloponnesus the *Eumenides* were carried far and wide, as we shall see—to Cyrene and Selinus and presumably to other cities of Sicily and Magna Graecia. The cult on Chios is unexpected; it must be due to some Dorian influence that we cannot identify. Zeus *milichios* (to adopt the form used at Selinus) is a different but similar deity of the

spring season who most often appears alone but sometimes with a female partner and sometimes with a group, who are perhaps respectively spouse and children.

The question arises whether Selinus' joint cult of Zeus *eumenês* and the *Eumenides* was a survival from of old or a new departure. Perhaps Zeus was added to the cult as an afterthought: whereas the name *Eumenides* was traditional, a feminine form used only as a divine name, the epithet *eumenês* imposed itself as the corresponding masculine. Or perhaps the combination was original, and Zeus *eumenês* was elsewhere dropped. There is good reason to think it is original.

If Zeus is worshipped beside the *Eumenides*, it is because they are thought to be related—related in a literal sense, according to the basic outlook of Greek polytheism. The relationship is very likely that of father and daughters. Zeus is father of other female groups with whom he is from time to time conjoined in cult: *Charites*, *Horai*, *Moirai*, *Musai*, various *Nymphai*, and even the whole class in the formula phrase κοῦραι Διὸς (αὐτοχόοι) .⁶ This outlook is best known from Hesiod, who credits Zeus with quite transparent wives and daughters so as to indicate the full extent of his physical and moral authority. It is of course a linguistic fact that Greek abstractions are mostly feminine and hence are goddesses to be somehow aligned with the prepotent weather god. Nonetheless Hesiod's starting point is the ordinary belief expressed by such cults as those mentioned.

Literary sources after Hesiod might be expected to say forthrightly whose daughters the *Eumenides* are. But according to a famous story they originate as the *Erinyes*, with a monstrous lineage of their own. So nothing is said—except in the compendious doctrine of later Orphic poetry. We shall take up the matter at the last.

Eumenides and Erinyes

It has long been debated, as a question arising from famous works of literature, whether the *Eumenides* are really the same as the terrible avenging *Erinyes*; good authorities beckon us from both sides. JJK equate *Eumenides* and *Erinyes* unreservedly.⁷ Yet they admit that *Erinyes* do not appear in cult.⁸ The two names, they say, express two sides of the same powers, kind and cruel, and the name for their cruel side is avoided.⁹ No parallel is offered for a divine name in general use that is other than the name used in cult.¹⁰ Such a case seems not to exist. Surely then it is poetry that first imagines *Erinyes* turning into *Eumenides*—in the story of Orestes—and treats the names thereafter as interchangeable.

At Selinus the *Eumenides* of cult cannot double as *Erinyes*. Zeus

eumenês is worshipped beside them, most likely as their father. Whatever the relationship, though it may not be integral to the cult, it is conformable. It is not conformable with the *Erinyes*, who are always said to be primeval powers antecedent to Zeus.¹¹

Let us now survey the actual cults more thoroughly than has been done before. The *Eumenides* prove to be vivid deities of nature, as uncertain as nature is at the beginning of spring. Their worship originates in the Peloponnesus and spreads to the west. We shall take them in the order Sicily, Cyrene, the Peloponnesus, other places.

Sicily

At Selinus the *Eumenides* were already known, or deducible, from the name *Εὐμενίδωτος*, a shortened form of *Εὐμενιδο-δωτος* “gift of the *Eumenides*” (IGDS 50 / SEG 40.806, sixth century).¹² Theophoric names are the sincerest form of devotion. This one is borne, appropriately, by one of three men sharing an early *milichios* stone in the sanctuary on Gaggera. The *Eumenides* are perhaps depicted on a metope of c. 475 B.C. from Selinus’ acropolis (Palermo, Mus. Arch. 3913).¹³ Three figures both robed and mantled, two on the left facing the other on the right, have been variously identified. The object that all three hold upright in one hand can be taken as a torch, otherwise as a stalk of wheat; then they are thought to be Hecate and Demeter welcoming Persephone on her return.¹⁴ But a triad of like deities has also been suggested—Moirai or Charites, with a spindle or a flower as the common emblem. If it is indeed a triad with either torch or flower as emblem, our tablet points to the *Eumenides* as a likely choice.¹⁵

The *Eumenides* of Selinus are also behind the month name *Εὐμενοίειος* at the Elymian city of Entella, occurring in the celebrated tablets from the time of the First Punic War (SEG 30.1117.3, 1118.3, 1120.2–3).¹⁶ A recent find shows Entella using Greek, and the alphabet of Selinus, as early as the sixth century (SEG 40.786). Its calendar of months will be just as early. But *Eumenideios* and the three other oddly disparate month names occurring in the tablets were not adopted as part of the calendar of Selinus or of any other Greek city. The names are individually suited to the customs of Entella.¹⁷ The month *Eumenideios* belongs to spring, or rather early spring, for it is immediately followed by the month *Εὐέρνειος*, named for the **Εὐέρνεια* “Goodly-sprouting rites” that celebrate advancing growth.¹⁸ The **Εὐμενίδεια* “rites of the *Eumenides*” come before this stage of spring. We cannot tell whether the festival itself was borrowed from Selinus or was a local custom equated with Selinus’ cult of the *Eumenides*. But if the latter, it still implies that the

Eumenides of Selinus are honored at the same season.

It is also noteworthy that Entella has yielded an Orphic gold leaf, fourth or third century B.C., with the longest text of any (*Orph. fr.* 475 Bernabé).¹⁹ The Derveni papyrus, perhaps 340–320 B.C., which is concerned both with Orphic ritual and with an Orphic *Hymn to Zeus*, speaks of initiates making a preliminary sacrifice to the *Eumenides* (col. VI lines 8–9).²⁰ Very much later, the Orphic *Rhapsodies* and the hymnbook of an Orphic congregation show a certain regard for the *Eumenides*.²¹ Orphic belief was strong in the west, both in Sicily and in Magna Graecia. Surely it was hereabouts that the *Eumenides* were taken up by Orphic literature from public worship—all the Orphic gods, including Dionysus and Persephone, were taken up from public worship with the intention of maintaining a strict observance.

Gela has the foremost cult in Sicily, though it has not been recognized. Herodotus in his account of Gelon, tyrant of Syracuse, tells how Gelon's family became prominent and powerful in their native city by reason of serving as hereditary

ἱεροφάνται τῶν χθονίων θεῶν “hierophants of the earth deities” (7.153.2–154.1).²² The office is usually taken as hierophant of Demeter and *Kore*.²³ But Herodotus always uses the name “Demeter” for the universal grain goddess, and uses it consistently of local cults that would be somehow similar to this one.²⁴ Herodotus' further details are markedly unsuited to Demeter's excavated sanctuary at the site Bitalemi on the east side of the city—it is an undoubted *thesmophorion*.²⁵ They are unsuited likewise to Demeter's monumental shrine at Syracuse, which was richly endowed by Hieron, Gelon's brother and successor.²⁶

Stasis at Gela, says Herodotus, was composed by Gelon's ancestor *qua* hierophant. The story is plainly aetiological, and this is generally granted, but it remains to draw the consequences.²⁷ A faction that had seceded from the city to an outlying eminence was brought back by the hierophant through the sole power of the *ἱρά* of these deities”: i.e. the event is commemorated by a festival procession between the outlying eminence and the city.²⁸ Despite his achievement, the hierophant was said to be “a womanish and rather soft person”: i.e. women are to the fore in the rites he conducted, making him womanish by association.²⁹ Though the cult site is on an eminence, the deities are described in the same breath as *χθόνιος* “of the earth”: i.e. they notoriously dwell below the ground.

To anticipate briefly, Athens' *Semnai Theai* are honored by a festival procession to their shrine on the Areopagus, in early days an outlying eminence; the altar here was stained with blood during Athens' legendary stasis, the Cylonian conspiracy, and was the starting point for expiatory sacrifices ascribed to Epimenides. It is the race of

women, not of men, we learn from Euripides' *Melanippe Captive*, to whom the *ἱερά* of the "nameless goddesses" are entrusted, by which is meant the *Eumenides* / *Semnai Theai*—but we also know that the Athenian worship was conducted by officiants both male and female of the priestly family *Hesychidai*. The *Semnai Theai* of the Areopagus dwell within a rocky cleft, and the *Eumenides* have much to do with snakes as creatures of the earth. Herodotus' indications all point to these deities; he expected them to be recognized by every reader.

"From whom he got them or how he came to be the owner, I am quite at a loss to say"—says Herodotus of the hierophant and the portentous *hiera*, right after saying that Gelon's family came from the island of *Telos* and that the hierophant was named *Têlinês*. The name *Τηλίνης* is probably unique and therefore probably fictitious.³⁰ It is the kind of disavowal, ostentatious but insignificant, that Herodotus often attaches to surprising stories.³¹ *Telos* lies off Rhodes and was later a Rhodian *demos*. Rhodes traces its earliest origins to Tiryns (Il. 2.661–66, etc.), which has likewise a cult of the *Eumenides*. In Sicily, Gela can be added to Selinus and Entella.

Cyrene

Cyrene has the only cult place that is known at first hand, though there is no excavated material. "The sanctuary of Ain Hofra is situated in a remarkably suggestive setting at the mouth of the like-named wadi, about 2 km. [east of] Cyrene, in an area frequented from the Middle Palaeolithic."³² An abundant spring has been turned into a virtual "Nymphaeum" with platforms and seats cut out of the surrounding rock. More than a hundred niches and altars, sometimes in groups of two or three, are carved in the rock face on the west. Some of them are identified by inscriptions that have been published in two instalments, by Ferri and by Oliverio (*SEG* 9.325–46, 20.723a–d).³³ The inscriptions name the proprietor(s) of a given niche or altar and the god(s) it serves, mostly both. One proprietor has the title *spondarchos* (*SEG* 9.344). The gods, mostly in combination, are (1) the *Eumenides* (thirteen times), (2) Zeus, with or without the epithet *melichios*, or this epithet alone (nine times), (3) *Hêrôes* (five times), and (4) *Kores melichios* (once).³⁴ When a niche or altar belongs at once to a given person and to a god or gods, it must have been used for private worship. The gods are thought of as dwelling in the earth, so that the persons have direct access at an individual site. But many of the niches and altars are not inscribed, and private worship need not be the only kind.

The spring is reached by a path and steps descending past a rock-cut portico, arguably meant as a tomb front, though there is no

chamber behind. And on the north slope there is “an extensive necropolis” with a built tomb of the fourth century that resembles a small temple.³⁵ Sanctuary and cemetery are sometimes thought to go together: it is held that the *Eumenides*, Zeus *meêlichios*, and *Hêrôes* belong to a funerary cult on behalf of the dead.³⁶ This notion of Zeus *meêlichios* in particular is asserted still, as often in the past, for both Cyrene and Selinus, but has been sufficiently refuted by JJK.³⁷ At Selinus the *milichios* stones in the *Gaggera* sanctuary have no funerary use; Zeus *milichios* in general has no connection with cemeteries or the dead; at Ain Hofra the sanctuary and the cemetery merely happen to be found together in a landscape that suits them both.

These deities of under-earth are worshipped rather for their power over nature’s growth as it emerges in the spring. At Sicyon, though the exact location is unknown, the shrine of the *Eumenides* is again right beside a stream, a tributary of the Asopus.³⁸ Their festival in early spring is the very time when a wadi or *rhevma* runs with water.³⁹ At Ain Hofra the association with Zeus *meêlichios* also points to early spring. When we come to Athens, we shall find that Zeus *milichios* and the *Semnai Theai* are both worshipped in early spring, not indeed at the same place or on the same day, but within a day or so of each other in the month *Anthesterion* = February. And at Selinus our tablet calls for sacrifice to the *Eumenides* and Zeus *milichios* at about the same time, not indeed at the same place, since only Zeus *milichios* is “in [the land] of *Myskos*,” and therefore probably not on the same day. But at Cyrene the far- off rural setting was surely meant for the worship of all these deities on the same day. Only then were so many niches and altars required. And the *spondarchos* must have officiated then. We should note as well that *spondai* rather than *choai* are addressed to the gods rather than the dead.

At Cyrene Zeus *meêlichios* goes with the *Eumenides* just as Zeus *eumeneês* does at Selinus. Perhaps he is likewise regarded as father. *Meêlichios* is the commonest epithet, as Zeus is the commonest name—though it is far from invariable—for the mighty god of under-earth. At Ain Hofra *melichios* is also used alone when a worshipper hesitates to say “Zeus”; so it is at Selinus, in the sanctuary on *Gaggera*, and so it is at other places.

Another deity appears in just one inscription (*SEG* 20.723d): *Λύσιος / Εὐμενίδων Κωρῆς μη-/λίχιος*. The proprietor and the *Eumenides* are named as usual in the genitive, but the unwonted *Kores melichios* is in the nominative, perhaps only because it is recognized more easily. This divine name is known from other inscriptions of Cyrene and also of Thera, but they are not informative. At Cyrene it is either *Κωρῆς* or *Κουρῆς* (*SEG* 9.107–8, 110, 20.757, 760, *Suppl. Epigr. Cir.* 226, 227, 232). On Thera, among the

early rock-cut inscriptions in the precinct of Apollo *karneios*, it is *Ζοφῆς* (IG 12.3 nos. 350, 354–55). The usual view is that this is Zeus himself.⁴⁰ Yet such a variant would be surprising at Ain Hofra, where “Zeus” is regularly named. It seems more likely that *Kores melichios* is son of Zeus *melichios*. The fertile god of under-earth otherwise begets a marvelous child called *Plutos*.⁴¹

Ἡρώων appear by themselves (SEG 9.337–39) and in company with the aforementioned deities (SEG 9.334, 336). *Hêrôes* dwelling in the earth like Zeus *melichios* can only be the general class of heroes, i.e. men of long ago conceived as powers that worshippers may summon. They are summoned, however, not at a putative burial place but at the niches and altars used also for the gods of under-earth. Such heroes are prominent at Selinus as well and in Orphic gold leaves. Our tablet prescribes sacrifice to the *Tritopatreis*, when they are foul, “as to the *heroes*” (chapter 10, pp. 164–65). The gold leaves, most plainly those of Entella and Petelia, promise a destiny as *heêroês* among *heêroôes*.⁴²

It is an old belief, this class of subterranean heroes, that has contributed largely to Hesiod’s scheme of the successive races of man (*Op.* 109–201). Hesiod gives substance to the scheme by asserting that the first and the second races, the gold and the silver, both survive as minor deities. The second, silver race is unmistakably the class of heroes: “they are called blessed, under-earth (*ὑποχθόνιοι*) mortals, a second kind, and yet they too receive honor” (*Op.* 141–42).⁴³ Hesiod cannot employ the very word *heroes* since in epic language these are legendary warriors and will be introduced as yet another race, the fourth. In the lines quoted, the second race is contrasted with the first one, the golden race, who after death are extolled as follows: “they are *daimones* by design of great Zeus, good, above-earth (*ἐπιχθόνιοι*), guardians of mortal men, conferring wealth” (*Op.* 122–23, 126). The two races differ *qua* deities, above-earth and under-earth, just as they differ in their manner of life, described at length with somewhat vacuous detail—serene and happy, rough and injurious.⁴⁴ Now minor deities who are “good, above-earth, guardians of mortal men, conferring wealth” do not correspond to any large or important class in Greek belief. On the other hand, minor deities who “are called blessed, under-earth mortals” correspond exactly to the class of heroes. It follows that the first class has been invented for the sake of the second.

In the homeland the old belief was mostly superseded by local cults of individual heroes and of groups, as in the agora. But it survived in the west, where such cults were not often found.

The Peloponnesus

The Peloponnesian cults belong to the Dorian cities Tiryns and Sicyon and probably Sparta, and to Megalopolis and Ceryneia close by. Apropos of Gela we have already added the Dorian outposts of Rhodes and Telos.

These cults are known from Pausanias and from other evidence that agrees in salient features. Pausanias comes first to a shrine of the *Eumenides* off the road from Sicyon to Titane on the east bank of the Asopus (2.11.4). The setting is a grove of holm oaks and a temple, where a festival is conducted once a year with sacrifice of gravid ewes, libation of honey-mix, and the wearing or carrying of flowers. The *Moirai* receive similar offerings at an altar nearby. The place was famous, being evoked by Statius in his account of the army of Adrastus (*Theb.* 4.50–58). There is a stream whose water was somehow used in the ritual; it must be a tributary of the Asopus.⁴⁵ Though Statius harps on the dreadfulness of the “Stygian” goddesses, the setting and the ritual point unmistakably to powers of nature, to powers active in the spring, when streams flow and flowers are most in bloom and a sacrifice of gravid ewes will reinforce the burgeoning vegetation.⁴⁶

As to the flowers, Pausanias’ expression is ambiguous. Celebrants are accustomed *ἀνθῆσιν ἀντὶ στεφάνων χρῆσθαι* “to use flowers instead of garlands.” Does he mean that they weave and wear garlands of flowery sprays instead of leafy shoots, the commonest kind? Or that they carry flowers, whether in baskets or in their hands, instead of wearing garlands? Carrying flowers in procession is a customary practice; so of course is the wearing of garlands of flowers. At Tiryns, as we shall see in a moment, votive reliefs show a file of three *Eumenides* holding poppies, doubtless in the image of their worshippers.⁴⁷ A basket, *kalathos*, brimming with flowers goes with scenes of the rape of *Koreê*, itself the *aition* of a spring festival at which women, according to an express report, both gather flowers in the meadow and weave them into garlands.⁴⁸ Whichever it is, Pausanias’ expression is unclear and even unnatural. Very likely it is a precious way of comprehending both.

The *Moirai* are presumably entreated to bestow the same favor on human lives.⁴⁹ In Euripides’ *Melanippe Captive* we are told how women, not men, are entrusted with the worship of “both the *Moirai* and the nameless goddesses” (P. Berol. 9772 recto col. iii = fr. 494 Kannicht / 659–60c Mette lines 18–23). For an Athenian audience “the nameless goddesses” meant first of all their own *Semnai Theai*, served by a group of *Hesychides* (Callim. fr. 68i).⁵⁰ But these were interchangeable with the *Eumenides*, so that by adding the *Moirai*

Euripides may well intend to evoke Sicyon—his other female ministrants are at nearby Delphi and remote Dodona.

A rural shrine near Tiryns, not precisely located, has yielded a series of votive reliefs running from the late fourth century down to the first, inscribed as offerings to the *Eumenides*.⁵¹ Where the inscriptions are legible, two of the reliefs are dedicated by men and five by women.⁵² Three goddesses, greeted by various worshippers, each hold a snake in one hand, a poppyhead in the other. This is the earliest and commonest type; later the poppyheads are replaced by flowers or plants, or there are only snakes. The snake is always in the hand nearer the viewer—whichever way the goddesses are facing—but the poppy-head is also conspicuous. So the snake can be taken in two ways, and perhaps it was. It may be a warning, as if to say that the goddesses are potent both to hurt and to help. Or it may be rather the surest sign of fertility and abundance.⁵³ And both emblems point to spring, when poppies bloom and snakes emerge from dormancy. Poppies are emblematic at Tiryns, as flowers are at Sicyon.⁵⁴

The inscribed reliefs at Tiryns suggest a like interpretation for another series, all from a single mold, occurring among the many reliefs offered at the shrine of Alexandra and Agamemnon at Amyclae: three goddesses stand between snakes rising on either side.⁵⁵ They must be the *Eumenides*, and the cult at Cyrene may be an offshoot. Yet the Spartan cult need not belong to the shrine of Alexandra and Agamemnon; votive offerings are sometimes rather indiscriminate. The relief scene proper to the *Eumenides* may have been offered to Alexandra and Agamemnon only because their shrine was near, or their worship was related, or for even less reason.

Pausanias describes another rural sanctuary near Megalopolis, on the road to Messene, where the *Eumenides* appear in different guises in adjoining areas, as “black” and “white” respectively, and receive the different forms of sacrifice denoted by *ἐναιγίζω* and *θύω*, and *θωω*, the latter being performed as well for the *Charites* (8.34.1–4).⁵⁶ Orestes, it was fabled, first in his madness and then on his recovery saw the different guises and performed the different rites. But the description of the sanctuary and the rites is just as apt for powers of nature who are cruel and kind by turn. The *Charites* are only powers of nature, and always kind.

At Ceryneia in Achaea another sanctuary of the *Eumenides* is carried back to Orestes and is entered only by permission; if an unworthy person sees what is inside, he goes mad straightway (Paus. 7.25.7). The grove of the *Semnai Theai* at Colonus, as we find it in Sophocles’ play, is likewise forbidden ground. And whereas the Athenian cult, at Colonus and elsewhere, is mostly for women, the sanctuary at Ceryneia is notable for statues of priestesses set up at the

entrance.⁵⁷

As we saw, cults of the *Eumenides* can be postulated for the Dorian islands of Rhodes and Telos. Herodotus says that Gelon's family with its hereditary priesthood came from Telos. If the name *Teêlineês* for the legendary hierophant is fictitious, the supposed origin may be so as well—but then the implication is that the cult here was especially renowned.

Other Cults

Outside this restricted range, in the Peloponnesus and at Dorian cities abroad, the *Eumenides* are but fleetingly attested.⁵⁸ They do not appear at Athens; it is only literature that identifies them with the local *Semnai Theai*. At Thespieae and on Chios they happen to be named in two inscriptions, neither dated.

The name alone is inscribed at Thespieae (IG 7J1783).⁵⁹ Thespieae has also a cult of Zeus *milichios* and of *Milichia* beside him, and his sanctuary is a landmark in a leasing inscription.⁶⁰ Possibly then the *Eumenides* were part of such a group as at Cyrene.

On Chios a “priesthood” seems to pertain to Zeus and the *Eumenides* together (SEG 38.833).⁶¹ Chios is also known for a country shrine of “*Eumenês*,” which gives rise to the story of a runaway slave with a name of opposite meaning, “*Drimakos*” (Nymphodorus of Syracuse FGrH 572 F4 = Ath. 6.88–9!, 265c–66e).⁶² He was the leader of a troublesome band of runaway slaves, but finally lent himself to reconciliation and is so commemorated, as one “of-good-will”, at an alleged hero shrine. In a Chian context, a story of disaffected slaves is like the story of civil strife at Gela and also like the Athenian story that goes with the *Semnai Theai* (ch. 7, pp. 111–13). The form of worship that we hear of is not unsuited to the *Eumenides* or the *Semnai Theai* as agrarian deities. Slaves offer *aparchai* at the shrine, and their masters receive monitory dreams. Quite conceivably, the priesthood of the inscription and the country shrine of the aetiological tale belong together as a cult of Zeus *eumenês* and the *Eumenides*.

Apart from guesswork, the cults at Thespieae and on Chios are most obscure. But it is likely that both of them were borrowed from the Dorian domain. The consistency of other evidence cannot be accidental.

The Story of Orestes

Further to the Peloponnesian cults, we can now see that they lent

themselves to the story of Orestes, of how the pursuing *Erinyes* finally relented. The snakes carried by the goddesses at Tiryns and the snakes framing the goddesses at Sparta probably mean that the goddesses were thought to appear as snakes, like Zeus *meilichios* and related forms of Zeus and like similar deities without Zeus' name. A goddess, to be sure, is never depicted in snake form, as those gods are, but this was likely a matter of convention.⁶³ And if they did not appear as snakes, snakes were still their creatures.

Snakes figure largely in the story of Orestes. It was Greek belief that the dead come back as snakes, and the belief could be alarming.⁶⁴ Stesichorus in his *Oresteia* told how Clytaemnestra dreamt of a snake with bloodied head (*PMG / PMGF* fr. 219), obviously representing Agamemnon, and portending vengeance, to judge by Aeschylus' adaptation of the dream (*Choeph.* 523–50). Stesichorus was also the first we know of to speak of the *Erinyes* as pursuing Orestes (*PMG / PMGF* fr. 217). How he described them is not said, but ever after snakes are a leading feature. Literary mentions begin with tragedy. They are entwined with snakes (Aesch. *Choeph.* 1049–50); they are “snakelike maidens” (Eur. *Or.* 256); they *are* snakes (Aesch. *Eum.* 128, Eur. *Iph. Taur.* 286). On vases, snakes coil in their hair or twine round their arms, or they brandish snakes.⁶⁵ It happens that the earliest pictorial instance, a white-ground lekythos displaying an iconic *Erinyes* with snakes in her hair and in each hand, is dated stylistically to 460–450 B.C., so that Aeschylus and the theater can be mooted as influence.⁶⁶ But it is not credible that the snakes originate with Aeschylus. Nor are snakes associated in any way with Athens' *Semnai Theai*—even though the goddesses dwell in clefts, as we shall see.

Stesichorus must have described this apanage of snakes. It is likely that they were taken from the cult of the *Eumenides* together with Clytaemnestra's nightmare snake, and that Stesichorus explained how the cult arose from Orestes' atonement. It is likely too that the *Oresteia* was performed at their spring festival.⁶⁷ Despite the grim story, this poem began with words of joy, which are echoed by Aristophanes in *Peace* (lines 774–80, 796–80i). It was a celebration of “the weddings of gods and the feasts of men and the recreation of the blessed” (*PMG / PMGF* fr. 210); it came “when the swallow twitters in springtime” (fr. 2ii); it included “public song for the fair-tressed *Charites*... at the beginning of spring” (fr. 212). The *Charites* are kindly powers of nature, and so are the *Eumenides* in their better mood.

Pausanias, we recall, situates Orestes' atonement at a sanctuary on the road west of Megalopolis that was shared by the *Eumenides* and the *Charites* (8.34. i- 4). He knows of antiquarian accounts, cited in Herodotean fashion as if they were oral informants (Πελοποννησίων

δε Ες τα ἀρχαῖα μνημονεοοντεο. . . φασον), which boldly asserted that this atonement preceded the trial at Athens. Euripides, while predicting Orestes' trial in Athens, predicts as well a sojourn in southwestern Arcadia, i.e. in the region later synoecized into Megalopolis, either after or before the trial (*Electra* 073–75, *Orestes* ^43–45). Behind both Euripides and Pausanias is the same strong tradition. It agrees with Stesichorus' *Oresteia*, recounting the atonement as *aition* of the Arcadian sanctuary and of the remarkable festival that continued to the time of Pausanias.

It is true that Orestes has other ties with Arcadia—as the epic or “Achaean” ancestor disputed between Tegea and Sparta, and as eponym of a plain or a town at the southwest. (These names, however, are properly *Oresth-* rather than *Orest-*.) Modern theorists assert that the hero Orestes is native to Arcadia or else that a native hero is conflated with Argive Orestes.⁶⁸ Yet nothing in the record points to a native Arcadian hero. There is no local genealogy, no local *geste*. At Megalopolis, as at Ceryneia, it is the Argive Orestes who entreats the *Eumenides* because he is pursued by the *Erinyes*.

The concept of punitive *Erinyes* goes back to early days, being very prominent in epic poetry. Perhaps they were always bound up with the downfall of Agamemnon's dynasty. Yet it was unnecessary to bring the matter to any conclusion since Orestes' generation is the last of the Heroic Age. Even with the conclusion we have, Orestes does nothing more of note. The conclusion is well suited to the cult of the *Eumenides*, powers of nature who appear as snakes and change from cruel to kind. Perhaps it was a popular tale sung by worshippers at the festival even before Stesichorus gave it literary currency.

Orestes' crime does not stand alone in literature. Alcmaeon too killed his mother, Meleager killed his maternal uncles, and Tlepolemus killed his father's maternal uncle.⁶⁹ Alcmaeon was pursued by the *Erinyes*, and so Meleager must have been, after his mother invoked them. The case of Tlepolemus is reported only in connection with the founding of Rhodes, so that the *Erinyes* are not relevant—and yet Homer chooses to say that Tlepolemus was pursued by “the other sons and grandsons of the might of Heracles,” avenging parties remarkably vague and obscure for such a story (Il. 2.665–66). Tlepolemus was at home in Tiryns, with its cult of the *Eumenides*. And the place he colonized, Rhodes, later colonized Telos, with its cult of the *Eumenides*. Alcmaeon likewise is very close to Tiryns; only Meleager is further off. The cult may be suspected behind the several stories of pursuing *Erinyes*.

It is natural to suppose that at Selinus the *Eumenides* are regarded as the daughters of Zeus *eumenês*. They are not so described in literature, however. After being equated with the *Erinyes*, they lost whatever place they had occupied in poetic genealogy—except that Orphic genealogy, as we find it in late sources, still keeps a place for them. This place is quite distinct from that of the *Erinyes*.

The Orphic *Rhapsodies* are fullest, as reported by Proclus in his commentary on Plato's *Cratylus*. Proclus gives two different views of the *Eumenides*, as the offspring prophesied for Persephone and Apollo and as the actual offspring of Persephone and Hades/Pluto. Both are surprising, especially the first, but both are supported by verbatim quotations. The second view is shared by Virgil and the Orphic *Hymns*.

The first view comes first in Proclus' commentary (on *Cratylus* 404e = *Orph.* fr. 284 Bernabe / 194 Kern). "According to Orpheus, Demeter, while entrusting the queenship to *Kore*, speaks thus:

But you shall mount Apollo's fertile bed
and bear glorious children with blazing faces."

The strange phrase "with blazing faces" is paralleled in an Orphic *Hymn*, 70.6–7, by a phrase even more alarming:

(Ye goddesses) flashing from your eyes
a terrible brilliant flesh-consuming gleam.

The second view is presented twice by Proclus (on *Cratylus* 404d = *Orph.* fr. 292 Bernabe / 197 Kern, and on *Cratylus* 406b = *Orph.* fr. 293 Bernabe / 197 Kern). *Kore* / Persephone "joins with Hades and with him begets the *Eumenides* of under-earth." And again, she "combines with the third demiurge [i.e. Hades] and bears

nine daughters, with gleaming eyes, *working with flowers*.

The second epithet ἀνθεστοργονο is unparalleled but recalls the emblematic flowers of our Peloponnesian cults, especially the "use" of flowers that Pausanias remarks at Sicyon. By analogy, the epithets or phrases "gleaming eyes" and "blazing faces" and "flashing from your eyes a gleam" may refer in figurative style to the bright colors of spring flowers.

In the Orphic *Hymns* the *Eumenides*, as distinct from the *Erinyes*, are offspring of Persephone and of Zeus *chthonios*, i.e. Pluto or Hades (29.6, 70.2–3). Virgil of course thoroughly conflates the *Eumenides* and the Furies and speaks of ancient Night as their mother (6.250, 0.846)—yet he also speaks of Pluto as a father who hates his daughter Allecto (7.327).⁷⁰

Now the first view, the mating of *Kore* and Apollo prophesied by Demeter, is otherwise unheard of. Ever since Lobeck, it has been a difficulty leading only to despair.⁷¹ Maybe the nine Muses were borne

by *Kore* to Apollo, an unparalleled idea.⁷² Or maybe she bore him the *Eumenides* in a hypothetical early theogony, unless it was only prophesied for a succeeding generation, in either case an unparalleled idea.⁷³ Or maybe *Kore* in the underworld bore the *Eumenides* to an underworld “Apollo,” whether this was a source of oracles or a sobriquet of Hades.⁷⁴ Or maybe we should give it up as inscrutable.⁷⁵

The occasion is Demeter’s entrusting the queenship to *Kore*: *ζυγχειροσονσα την βασολειαν τη Ερρηι*. This notion of *Kore* / Persephone as universal queen is fundamental to Orphic belief, from the gold leaves to the *Rhapsodies*. It was not first conceived as a clever means of capping the theogonic succession; it is faithful to the original and abiding Persephone of cult. Though Persephone is identified with the grain maiden in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* and in consequence at Eleusis, she continued to be widely worshipped in her own right.⁷⁶

Her title is *Παμβασίλεια* at Paros and *Πασικράτεια* at Selinus, both meaning “Queen of All.”⁷⁷ The title is evoked for a moment in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* at the climax of the second part. Hades consents to release his bride so that she may return to her mother in the upper world. Then he addresses her in words that are entirely inapposite (lines 364–66). “When you are there, *δεσπόσσεις πάντων* you shall rule over all that lives and moves, and you shall have the highest office among the gods.”⁷⁸

Persephone and Apollo are suitable parents for the *Eumenides* because both are vigorous deities of early spring. Persephone’s characteristic festival is often called *Koreia* or *Pherephattia* in later literature and inscriptions.⁷⁹ But more authentic names refer to the burgeoning of flowers in spring, *Herosantheia* or *Chrysanthina* or *Anthesphoria* or *Antheia*.⁸⁰ The cult site is a spring or fountain, such as Cyane at Syracuse, beside which a fresh carpet of flowers suddenly announces the goddess. She is herself the streaming water. The original form of the name, implied by the many dissimilated forms, is *Φερσέφασσα*. *Φερσ-* has been reduplicated with the feminine ending *-ασσα*; simple *Φέρσις* is used in the famous cult at Locri (Diod. 27.4.7). *Φερσ-* is *φρεσ-* by metathesis. *φρεσ-* resembles *-φρι-*, *-φρε-*, *-φρησ-* as combining forms of *προ(η)ίημι* in such words as *ἐξεφρίομεν*, *ἐκφρες*, *ἐπεισέφρησα*.⁸¹ It resembles also the forms of *Φερσέφασσα* as *nomen actionis* in such words as *προίημι*. So *προίημι* is readily explained as a reduplicated participle form of *παντοκράτειρα*. In epic and later poetry *παντοκράτειρα* is characteristically used of springs and streams and rivers “pouring forth” a flow of water.⁸²

Apollo is another deity whose advent in spring is joyfully proclaimed. As a rule, he arrives in early *Thargelion* = May, which is

also the moment of his birth on the sacred island of Delos. This is three months later than the festivals of Persephone and the *Eumenides* at the very beginning of spring, in *Anthesterion* = February. There is however one great exception to the usual pattern of Apollo's festivals. At Delphi he is said to arrive—indeed is said to have been born—on 7 *Bysios* = February (Plut. *Qu. Gr.* 9, 292d-e). From this moment the oracle gave responses. Delphi looked for business as soon as travelers took to the roads, whereas Delos waited for sailing weather.

Orphic doctrine draws on Delphic ritual. With the Orphic story of the child Dionysus, this is generally admitted.⁸³ Indeed it is evident in Plutarch's account of Delphi, as amplified by inscriptions of the Roman period.⁸⁴ A body of five called "the *Hosioi*," headed by a "presbys of the *Hosioi*," are appointed for life from Delphian families, and without being actual priests assist in the procedure of opening the oracle. About the same time, these *Hosioi* "offer a secret sacrifice in the sanctuary of Apollo when the Thyiades awaken the *liknites*"—the infant Dionysus in his cradle. Both the title *Hosioi* and the ceremonies they perform are plainly secondary; Orphic doctrine is behind it.

The Orphic story of Demeter's prophecy to *Kore* is likewise explicable from Delphic ritual. Apollo arrives at Delphi with the first growth of spring, at the very moment Persephone rises from the earth.

In the Delphic calendar, *Βύσιος = Φύσιος < Φύσια [ἱερά]* "growing [rites]." Apollo and Persephone are the inevitable parents of the *Eumenides*, lesser powers of the same burgeoning of spring. Alas, the inevitable did not happen. *Kore* was carried off by Hades / Pluto, to her mother's dismay; the *Eumenides* were born to him instead.

So the *Eumenides* have a place in divine genealogy, like almost every deity and especially like collective groups of female deities, but it is not quite the place we expect. Let us now assign that place to them as an exercise of the imagination. They will be daughters of Zeus, like some other collective groups who are powers of nature. And they will be born to him by Persephone, the great goddess of nature's burgeoning in spring. At Selinus, at the time of our tablet, the parents will be Zeus *eumenês* and *Pasikrateia*. But this parentage cannot be registered in literature, once Persephone has been made over as *Kore*. Instead, the parents will be Hades and Persephone or, as a wishful intimation, Apollo and Persephone.

1. Curiously, Siewert (2002, 366) associates the sacrifice to Zeus *eumenes* with the Olympic truce. He supposes that the Eleian heralds who come to each city to announce the truce are entertained "in the local sanctuary of the same god," who is more truly Zeus *Olympios*. He supposes also that our tablet describes this occasion at Selinus with all the sacrifices of column A pertaining thereto. The interpretation is arbitrary and untenable.

2. It was Zeus, we learn next, who admonished the founder in a dream (line 12). The founder himself might be fitly described as *eumenes* “of good will,” for he opened his new association to everyone, men and women, free and slave (lines 4–6).

3. Robert (1934, 287–91) assembles and interprets the documents: coins (second century B.C.?) with the legend “of Zeus *Larisaïos* and Zeus *eumenes*”; a decree (second century B.C.?) to be set up “in the shrine of Zeus *Larasaïos eumenes*”; and a dedication to Hadrian as identified with Zeus *Larasaïos eumenes*. Robert (1934, 290) concludes, after O. Weinreich, that the epithet is in part a tribute to or reminiscence of Eumenes II. JJK 77 speak too simplistically of “a creation of the Eumenid rulers of Pergamum.”

4. It is possible that a purported hero *Eumenes* as worshipped on Chios is to be equated with Zeus and the *Eumenides* as also worshipped there. The aetiology attached to the cult is a Euhemerist invention recounting how a “bitter” person was transformed into one “of-good-will” (pp. 98–99 below).

5. Pulleyn (1997, 219) documents *eumenes* as one of the “common words in Greek prayers.” *LGPN* I, II, III A-B registers eighty-two instances of *Eumenes* in all parts of the Greek world and a few more of *Eumeneis*, *Eumenon*, *Eumenios*, *Eumeneia*, and *Eumenides* or *Eumenidas*. But at Selinus, *Eumenidotos* = *Eumenido-dotos* (see note 12).

6. The cult instances can be traced in Hamdorf(1964) and in H. Schwabl, *RESuppl.* 15 (1978, 1247–58) s. Zeus (apropos of mythical “children,” with cross-references to cult). JJK 77 point to Zeus *Damatrios* and Athena *Areia*, but these relationships are different (they are discussed by Parker [2005b, 219–21, 225]).

7. JJK 79–81, 103. Dubois (1995a, 558; 1995b, 133–34) calls Zeus *eumenes* and the *Eumenides* “a coupling of terrible divinities.” But Clinton (1996, 166–70) favors the correct view that the *Eumenides* are serviceable powers of nature distinct from the *Erinyes*.

8. Three instances sometimes alleged are to be discounted. *IG* 12.3.367 is a rock-cut inscription on Thera, perhaps fifth century, read by O. Kern as

Ἐπι[νύ]ες: even if the reading is correct, it need not imply cult. We hear of “a shrine of the *Erinyes* of Laius and Oedipus” at Sparta (Hdt. 4.149.2) and again of a temple of “Demeter *erinyes*” at Thelpusa in Arcadia, with a large torch-bearing statue so called (Paus. 8.25.4–7, citing also Antim. fr. 33 Matthews and agreeing with Callim. fr. 652). However the nomenclature arose, these are not *Erinyes* proper. A fourth instance or something like it has lately been suggested at Cyrene. Dobias-Lalou (1987, 89; 2000, 223) points to an Archaic altar with an enigmatic inscription,

SECir 154, s. VI, in which she supplies the word *ἐλινύμενος* as an epithet of Zeus (so Hsch. s.v.), taking it as *ἐρινύμενος* < *ἐρινύειν*, rather like Demeter’s epithet. This is much too uncertain to signify.

9. Apart from Selinus, this is a common view of the relationship between the names *Erinyes* and *Eumenides*. “Although these names refer to opposite aspects of the same group of divinities, these goddesses were worshipped solely in their positive aspect and not in their negative one”: Henrichs (1994, 38). “It would be surprising indeed if any official document called these goddesses by the title associated with their negative side”: Johnston (1999, 270). Every deity can have a negative effect, but what other deity goes by different names, positive and negative?

10. Cults of the *Eumenides* in the Peloponnesus and of the *Semnai Theai* at Athens and environs were later seen in the light of the story of Orestes and the pursuing *Erinyes*, but even so the dreadful name was never used by worshippers. The cult of Demeter at Eleusis was seen in the light of the story of the rape as recounted in Demeter’s *Homeric Hymn*, a rare instance of a major cult influenced by myth (Nilsson 1951, 10)—and the somewhat forbidding names “Hades,” “Pluto,” also “the

god,” were in fact used here to a limited extent. Clinton (1996, 166–67) compares the practice at Eleusis, but in truth it makes a contrast.

11. “Ah, child of Zeus... new fledged, you have trampled down ancient female powers” (Aesch. *Eum.* 149–50, almost the first words spoken by the *Erinyes*).

12. D. R. Jordan (1991) confirms the reading *Εὐμε-/νιδότο*. Cf. JJK 77, 90, Dubois (1995a, 558; 1995b, 133–34); Lazzarini (1998, 313–14). Jordan (1991, 282) adduces *Eumenides* of Halicyae (Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.15), but this is a patronymic of *Eumenes*.

13. LIMC 4 (1988) *add.* Demeter 330 (L. Beschi). Opinions are either Hecate, Demeter, and Persephone, with a torch (V. Tusa); or the same with a stalk of wheat (Beschi); or Moirai with a spindle (L. Giuliani); or Charites with a flower (P. Zancani-Montuoro).

14. It may be doubted whether a stalk of wheat is appropriate to all three. In the Eleusinian relief showing a seated Demeter and either Hecate or Persephone (Eleusis 5085)—adduced by Beschi—Demeter alone holds three stalks of wheat.

15. At Tiryns, as we shall see, three *Eumenides* are often depicted holding flowers. At Athens, in the equivalent cult of the *Semnai theai*, torches are an important instrument, taken over in art by the *Erinyes* (chapter 7). The mantles worn by the goddesses may point to the chilly weather of early spring.

16. Porciani (2001) reviews opinions about the dating of the tablets (the late fourth century has also been argued).

17. The other month names are *EPépveios* (SEG 30.1120.17) and *Πενναμῖο* (SEG 30.1121.4, 1123.4). *Eumenideios* and *Euerneios* are successive (see note 18).

Πάναμος, Πάνημος is among the commonest of Greek month names but comes at different seasons: the ritual term **Πάναμα, *Πάνημα* was therefore applied to different occasions in the year. This adjective form is probably

abbreviated from *πανῆμαρ, as Μουνύχια* is probably abbreviated from *Μουννο-νύχια*,

so that they mean respectively “all-day rites” and “rites only at night.” Whereas the *Munychia* are a spring festival of Artemis, the *Panema* are sometimes a summer festival of hers; it could well be a summer festival at Entella. A decree of Nacone, also belonging to this dossier, is dated with the month name

Ἀδώνιος (SEG 30.1119 = Lupu 2005 no. 26, lines 2, 9). *Adōnios*, named for *Adonia* “Adonis rites,” is unparalleled except for *Adonion* in the very miscellaneous calendar of Iasus, where it cannot be placed. Nacone doubtless acquired her notion of Adonis from the neighboring Phoenicians. The **Phoinikaia* “Phoenician rites,” which give the month name *Phoinikaios* at Corinth and her colonies, may well be the lament for Adonis. *Phoinikaios* = *Munychiōn* or *Thargelion*: Robertson (1982, 340–42).

18. A council decree of 30 *Eumenideios* is ratified by an assembly decree of 4 *Euerneios* (SEG 30.1120.2–3, 16–17).

19. Cf. Bernabe (1999, 53–63; 2000, 45–49), Riedweg (2002). “Petro,” the reputed provenance, was identified by G. Nenci *apud* Bernabe (1999, 53) as Petraro, site of the Entella necropolis.

20. Kouremenos, Parassoglou, and Tsantsanoglou (2006, 73). The *Eumenides* are almost certainly equated with the *Erinyes*, of whom cols. I–IV make much ado, but this is in accordance with the general outlook of the day. At II 7 the editors restore

the unwonted singular, *τ[ῆι Εὐμειν]ίδι*, which seems venturesome. The Orphic poem expounded in cols. VIII–XXVI is most likely a *Hymn to Zeus*, recounting the story of his cosmic triumph—it seems to be introduced as a hymn at VII 2, and a corpus of hymns is referred to at II 8 and XXII II and is perhaps indicated also by the discussion of Hermes in col. XXVI. The poem came to be thought of as a much-

abbreviated theogony long before Tsantsanoglou announced the reading $\tilde{\upsilon}] \mu \nu \omicron \nu$ in VII 2. There is no reason to persist with such a notion now.

21. *Orph. frs.* 284 Bernabe / 194 Kern, 292–93 Bernabe / 197 Kern, *H. Orph.* 70. According to the *Rhapsodies*, as we shall see, the *Eumenides* were the intended offspring of Persephone and Apollo but became the actual offspring of Persephone and Hades after he abducted her.

22. Cf. Philistus *FGrH* 556 F 3, 49, Timaeus 566 F 96.

23. So Dunbabin (1948, 64, 66, 178, 180, etc.), Zuntz (1971, 136–38), and indeed most comment on either Gelon or Gela.

24. 1.171.2 (*thesmophoria* in general), 4.53.6 (Hippolaus promontory), 5.61.2 (Gephyraeans), 6.91.2 (Aegina), 6.134.2 (Paros), 7.200.2 (Anthela), 9.57.2 etc. (Eleusis), 9.65.2 etc. (Plataea and Mycale).

25. On Bitalemi see Kron (1992).

26. Shrine and priesthood at Syracuse: Pind. *Ol.* 6.94–95, schol. “6.158,” Diod. 11.26.7, 14.63.1, 70.4. On the probable location of the cult see Sfameni Gasparro (1986, 234–35). Pindar’s scholiast, citing Didymus, links Hieron’s reputed priesthood of Demeter and *Kore* with the hereditary priesthood at Gela, but Philistus F 49 did not, if it goes with F 3. Kron (1992, 648–49) firmly dissociates Herodotus’ account from Syracuse and doubtfully from Bitalemi but does not take up the ensuing question of what cult is really meant.

27. It is not granted by everyone. “Did Telines threaten to invoke the goddesses’s aid in blighting the wheat crop if the quarrelling parties refused to put aside their differences?” So White (1964, 262).

28. The faction seceded

$\epsilon\varsigma$ *Μακτώριον πόλιν τὴν ὑπὲρ Γέλης*. Conformably with the term *polis*, this is generally taken to be a settlement site, a Sikel one, in the hinterland of Gela. There is however no agreement which it might be: Manni (1981, 199). As Dunbabin (1948, 113) remarks, the place is quite close to Gela, which rules out any such site. It is close enough for women and a womanish hierophant to go there on parade. Furthermore, the story presupposes that the site is known for the ritual commemoration and *not* for any persisting settlement—“*polis*” is for the sake of the legendary stasis. Given the ritual use, *Μακτώριον* may be a variant of *μακτήριον* < *μάττω* as applied to a propitiatory offering of cakes.

29. See chapter 19 p. 293 as regards the **Battidai* of Cyrene.

30. *LGPV* IIIA *Τηλίνης* (Gela) 1–2 cites respectively Herodotus and *IG* 14.258. The latter as reported by Josephus Trigona de Rabugino is a cylindrical cippus inscribed $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$ *ἱεραπόλου Τελίνε[ως τ]ο[υ]* $\mathcal{A}[- - -]$. But it was never found thereafter by anyone who looked for it. All other names in *Τηλ-* (cf. *Τειλ-*, *Πηλ-*, *Πειλ-*) appear to derive from *τῆλε*. And is there another personal name formed from the name of an Aegean island with the suffix *-ino-* denoting quality? The suffix regularly appears in names that are no

doubt fictitious: *Βροτίνος*, “mortal” relation of immortal Pythagoras, *Πρατίνας*, “first” inventor of Dorian satyr plays.

31. See Fehling (1989) (but it does not follow that the stories are always Herodotus’ own invention).

32. *Cirene* 182 (E. Fabbricotti).

33. = Ferri (1923, 12–22, pl. 10), Oliverio (1961, 29). Cf. JJK 88–89, Lazzarini (1998, 311–13).

34. When JJK 77–78 tabulate the distribution in different ways, they somehow count only nine instances of *Eumenides*. The inscriptions in question are *SEG* 9.325,

327, 330, 332–36 (with the name appearing twice in 334) and *SEG* 20.7a (with the name appearing twice), 7c-d.

35. Fabbricotti (see note 32) does not say how this necropolis is documented, and I have not unearthed it (*sit venia verbo*) in the bibliography of “necropolises” at *Cirene* 219.

36. So Lazzarini (1998, 314–17), followed by Fabbricotti (see note 32).

37. JJK 96–97. Admittedly, JJK 78 (cf. 88, 96) deny the existence of a cemetery at Ain Hofra, but this point is not after all decisive.

38. The shrine of Alexandra at Amyclae, where the *Eumenides* appear on a few of many votive reliefs, is somewhere near a tributary of the Erasinus, but this type of relief probably comes from another Spartan shrine.

39. Lazzarini (1998, 316), after A. M. Prestianni, and followed by Fabbricotti, remarks of Zeus *milichios* as partner of the *Eumenides* that he is often found beside a stream, water being important to his “cathartic” function. But purification is only a means, not an end, and does not define the cult.

40. Cook (1914, 142, 144), Braun (1932, 13–15), Fraser (1962, 24–25), JJK 88–89.

41. It is worth mentioning that the two inscriptions naming *Melichios* alone are so restored: *[Μ]ηλιχι[ω]* (*SEG* 9.328), *[Μη]λι[χίω]* (*SEG* 9.331). *μηλιχας* could be restored just as well. If the god of under-earth has daughters and a son, he also has a spouse, who is indeed attested elsewhere and with this name ([chapter 12](#), p. 192).

42. At Entella the dead man is addressed at the very moment of death as *μεμνημένος ἥρωος* “*hêrôs* mindful” of what to do and say in the realm below (*Orph.* fr. 475 Bernabé). At Petelia he is promised *ἄλλοισι μεθ’ ἥρώεσσιν ἀνάξει[s]* “you will lord it among other heroes” (*Orph.* fr. 476 Bernabé / 31a Kern). Bernabé *ad* fr. 475 line 2 cites literary parallels, but Asius fr. 14 West should probably be stricken. The “hero risen from the mud” is susceptible of more than one interpretation apart from eschatology (cf. e.g. D. E. Gerber *ad loc.* [Loeb ed. 1999]).

43. That these are heroes is generally agreed. So, with varying emphasis, Rohde (1925, 73–74), S. Eitrem, *RE* 8.1 (1912) 1112 s. Heros, Farnell (1921, 12–14), West *ad loc.* (Oxford 1978, 181, 186), Koenen (1994, 3–4), and perhaps Wilamowitz *ad loc.* (Berlin 1928, 57), though obscurely: “they must live on beneath the earth, but only as men.”

44. It is also said of the silver race, quite insistently, that they refused to honor the immortals or to sacrifice on altars *in the customary way for men everywhere* (*Op.* 135–37, 138–39). Is it to explain why heroes are worshipped differently from the gods?

45. There are two streams at Sicyon whose waters lave Adrastus’ host: *\Strangilla* and *Elisson* (lines 51–52). *Saevus honos fluvio* “a grim distinction attaches to the stream,” i.e. one of these two, also referred to as *amnis* (lines 53, 58). Here the *Eumenides* purify themselves when they ascend from the underworld or return from some horrid mission. Since the *Elisson* is farther off, it can only be *\Strangilla*, as a tributary of the Asopus otherwise unknown. The manuscript variants merely serve to show that the name was wholly unfamiliar. *Stazusa*, Klotz’s conjecture, is not a stream but a fountain in a different quarter (Paus. 2.7.4).

46. Gravid victims such as ewes, cows, and sows are commonly offered to Demeter as grain goddess and to deities like her: Nilsson (1955, 151–52), Graf (1985, 27n61), Georgoudi (1994), Scullion (1994, 86), and Bremmer (2005) (Bremmer differs from everyone else in supposing that the pregnancy of victims marks an abnormal opposition to the normal way of sacrifice).

47. Blech (1982, 296) cites the reliefs as proving that “flowers and not garlands of flowers serve as gifts to the *Eumenides* at Sicyon,” but this does not follow.

48. Str. 6.1.5, p. 256 (Hipponium colony of Locri); cf. Hsch., Phot. s.

Εὐμενίδων (Peloponnesus).

49. The *Moirai* are joined in cult with a wide range of more substantial deities, and likewise in pictorial scenes both narrative and iconic. Cf. S. De Angeli, *LIMC* 6.1 (1992, 638, 646) s. *Moirai*. At Cameirus a stele listing several deities and groups of

deities in the genitive, seemingly a boundary stone, includes *Μο[ι]ρᾶν / εὐμενέων*, perhaps “kindly Fates” (Sege and Pugliese Carratelli [1953, 127.5–6]). The next and last is *Ζηνόςμεσαρ[κ]εῖ[ο]*, perhaps *meserkeios* = *herkeios* (127.7). The whole series is obscure, and comment is unavailing (cf. Morelli [1959, 144, 162]).

50. *Semnai Theai* / *Eumenides* are “the nameless goddesses” at Eur. *Iph. Taur.* 944 and are “nameless,” too, at Diog. Laert. 1.110.

51. Papachristodoulou 1968, H. Sarian, *LIMC* 3 (1986) s. *Erinys* 112–19.

52. Men: *LIMC* *Erinys* 112–13, fourth to third century. Women: *LIMC* *Erinys* 114, 116–19, third to first century. The later reliefs are unusual in depicting the female worshippers as of almost equal stature with the goddesses: E. Vikela, *ThesCRA* 1 (2004, 286).

53. Küster (1913, 142–43), after J. E. Harrison, regards the snakes of the *Eumenides* as a fertility symbol.

54. The correspondence was noted long ago by Odelberg (1896, 121n2).

55. Salapata (1995). In a future study she will associate the *Eumenides* with “a sacrificial propitiatory ceremony” in the cult of Alexandra and Agamemnon; cf. Salapata (2002, 146–48).

56. The adjoining areas are called *Μανίαι* “Frenzies” and *Ἀκή* “Healing.” Of the first, Pausanias says, “it is in my opinion a title of the *Eumenides*”; of the second, “there too a shrine is accorded the *Eumenides*.” If the second case is definite, so is the first, though adorned with a show of circumspection. We should not infer, with Jost (1985, 527–28) among others, that the name *Eumenides* is secondary and those descriptive names original—they would be unparalleled.

57. Pausanias also remarks statues of priestesses at the Argive Heraeum and at the temple of Demeter at Hermione, both likewise set up at the entrance (2.17.3, 35.8).

58. It is possible, no more, that the *Ἀβλαβίαι* of Erythrae are the *Eumenides* under another name (*IvErythrai* 201 a 34). This one would suit many other deities who do not inflict harm when they might. If chosen *per contrarium*, it would suit enforcers of quasi-judicial ordeals like the *Praxidikai* of Haliartus. In any case, nothing is known of the cult except that the priesthood was worth little.

59. The object is a marble plaque inscribed *IvErythrai*, reported by Lolling as an isolated find. Schachter (1981, 221, cf. 147) mentions *Agathos Daimon*, *Daimones*, and Zeus as possibly related figures.

60. See Schachter (1994, 152). He also cites a relief depicting sacrifice at an altar beside which a snake twines around a tree.

61. = Garbrah (1988, 73n5):
[τ]ὸ Ζανὸς [καὶ] / [Ε]ὐμενίδ[ων.] / [.]ενεπεω[.] / [ι]ερητε[ίην].
The article used with one name and not the other is surprising. The forms *Ζανός*, *Ζανί* occurring on Chios and at Ephesus in half a dozen different cults can only be local Ionic (cf. Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* i .577; a reminiscence of *Ζαν-* at Olympia, favored by Graf [1985, 25n41], would produce *Ζην-* in Ionic). Another

such on Chios is the lightning god (ch. 15, p. 238). The term *ἑρπτεῖν* points to either of two common classes of Chian inscription, rules of sacrifice or entitlements of a priesthood (cf. Parker [2006, 67, 74]).

62. See Graf O985, 121–25).

63. Menacing snakes on metope 26 at Paestum, on the Tyrrhenian amphora Berlin PM VI 4841, and on one or two other vases, are sometimes identified as an Erinyes, but Sarian, *LIMC* 3.i (1986, 841) s. Erinyes and Gantz (1993, 679, 879) are against it.

64. Cf. Küster (1913, 62–85).

65. H. Sarian, *LIMC* 3.i O986) nos. i, 4, 27, 37–39, 41–43, 45, 48–52, 55, 57–59, 63, 69–71.

66. Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum ZA i = Sarian, *LIMC* 3.i no. i. Influence from the theater is “possible,” says Sarian (1986, 26) and again *LIMC* 3.i p. 84b

67. It has been held by some that the poem favored Sparta and was performed there; against this, see A. Lesky, *RE* 18.i (1939, 978) s. Orestes i.

68. Lesky, *RE* 18.i (1939) 966, 984–85, 988–90, 1008. Lesky discusses and rejects the view that Orestes originates in Arcadia. But he also (966–67) propounds a view of his own, that Orestes goes back to *Orest-* nomenclature in Macedonia, and that his story was carried south in the southward migration of Greek peoples. Jost O985, 528; 1998, 228) thinks of homonymous Argive and Arcadian heroes.

69. Alcmaeon: Gantz (1993, 14–15) (“largely a blank in early sources,” but most details cannot be otherwise accounted for). Meleager: *Il.* 9.571–72, etc. Tlepolemus: Hom. *Il.* 2.662, Pind. *Ol.* 7.27–29. Tlepolemus, like Orestes, goes to Delphi as a notable anachronism (Pind. *Ol.* 7.31–33).

70. Furthermore, it is on the threshold of Hades that we encounter the *ferrei... thalami* “iron bedchambers” of the *Eumenides* / Furies (*Aen.* 6.280). According to Servius, they are still living at home as unmarried maidens: some such explanation is needed for an abode separate from their post as warders and tormentors of the damned. Antimachus in his *Artemis* (*Suppl. Hell.* fr. 65 / 112 Matthews) gives us *χρῆκες*... *Θελαμο* evidently Virgil’s model (so Matthews, after F. Carrara). This is apropos of an *Erinyes* darting up from Hades, perhaps likewise the model for Allecto (*Aen.* 7.324–48)—inasmuch as Hades is said to be *οσητρως* (*τς ονΘωμςν τς τςρ Comment. Antim.* 1.44, but rather *nomen agentis* of *Οσςω*, *LSJSuppl.* s.v.), and Allecto is said to be *luctificam*.

71. The two passages were adduced by Lobeck (1829, 544) with other evidence that he took to show that *Koree*, like Artemis, was also known as Hecate. The details of both he dismissed as “obscure.”

72. Schuster (1869, 72–73).

73. West (1983, 95, 98, cf. 243–44).

74. Apollo *chthonios* as source of oracles: Foerster (1874, 47n2), citing Proclus on Pl. Tim. 40 b-c, cf. Gruppe (1906, 1235n3). Apollo as “destroyer,” scil. Hades: West (1983, 95).

75. Brisson (1987, 66).

76. Persephone’s original nature is the subject of Zuntz (1971), a learned and searching work but distorted by a fanciful notion of the “Queen of Death” and by a determined refusal to recognize any Orphic contribution.

77. *Pambasileia* at Paros: *IG* 12.5.310 line 15. *Pasikrateia* at Selinus, next after *Malophoros* = Demeter: *IG* 14.268 = *GHI*38 = *SEG* 49.1328*.

78. It is noteworthy that the Orphic *Hymn* to Persephone, no. 29, even though addressed to the consort of Pluto and queen of the underworld and even though alluding to the story of the rape, also gives full measure to the goddess of spring

(lines 9–13) and employs a poetic variant of her cult title, *παντοκράτειρα* (line 10).

79. *Koreia* at Cyzicus and Syracuse, *Korea* at Sardis, *Pherephattia* at Cyzicus, *Koreis katagôgê* at Syracuse, *Koragia* at Mantinea.

80. Festivals of Demeter and/or *Kore* named for flowers are treated by Nilsson (1906, 357), Piccaluga (1966), and Richardson on *H. Cer.* 6ff., 141–42. “It is certainly this ritual custom,” says Nilsson, “that has prompted the story of the flower-gathering *Kore*, which serves as *aition*; it would, if better known, have contributed also to the understanding of the goddess.”

81. As to the origin of these words see Schwyzer, *Gr. Gram.* 1.689, Frisk and Chantraine s. **πίφρημι* (< *εἰσπιφράναι*, Arist. *Hist. Anim.* 5, 541 b 11). It is an older fashion, and quite misleading, to speak of the “rare verbs”

εἰσφρέω, *ἐκφρέω* and the like, as in *LSJ* and in commentaries on the plays of Euripides and Aristophanes where the forms in question chiefly occur.

82. Titaresius *προΐει* its water into Peneius (Il. 2.752), and remarkably the inflow continues separate like oil on water: the Titaresius is a magic stream fed directly by the Styx (755). After smoothing out the traces of the Achaean wall,

Poseidon returns each river to the channel where it *πρόσθεν ἔεν* its water (Il. 12.33). From Liliaea, renowned as the source of the Cephissus (Frazer on Paus.

10.33.5), this considerable river *προΐει* its water [past Chaeroneia] ([Hes.] fr. 70.18). In all these cases the verb is followed at the end of the line by

καλλίρροον ὕδωρ, “an under-represented formula” (J. B. Hainsworth). A spring at Troezen is fed directly by *Okeānos*—like Styx in Arcadia—while likewise

προιῖσα its water down a precipice (Eur. *Hipp.* 124). In the *Catalogue of Ships* and in Euripides, the usage is definitely linked with cult belief.

83. Cf. Robertson (2003b, 222–26).

84. Plut. *Qu. Gr.* 9, 292d, *De Is. et Os.* 35, 365a, *De def. or.* 49, 437a–b, 51, 438a, and Delphic inscriptions: all discussed by Amandry (1950, 123–25).

The *Semnai Theai*

Synopsis

The *Eumenides* require us to consider the *Semnai Theai* as well, for two reasons. First, both “*Eumenides*” and “*Semnai Theai*” are treated by literary sources as the real-life names of the epic *Erinyes*, and it is generally held, but wrongly, that the Athenian cult of the *Semnai Theai* gave rise to both equations. Second, the *Semnai Theai* of Athens are in truth agrarian deities very similar to the *Eumenides* of the Peloponesus, and the fuller information that we possess for the Athenian instance can be brought to bear on Dorian custom. As to the first point, Aeschylus’ play about the Areopagus cult of the *Semnai Theai* is known as “*Eumenides*” only because it builds on the preexisting equation of *Eumenides* and *Erinyes*. This guarantees the second point, that the Athenian cult matches the Dorian one in all essentials, especially in its calendar occurrence. It can be securely dated to the last days of *Anthesteriôn* = February, beside the festival of Zeus *milichios*, which comes next in Selinus’ tablet. We see distinctly that the worshippers are women, and that they carry torches and plunge them into the earth to bring the needed warmth. This rite of spring is embodied not only by the *Eumenides* as a group but by the individual figures of *Dêiô*, of *Daeira*, of Hecate; it gives rise to mythical accounts both in mainstream and in Orphic literature. And like the festival of Zeus *milichios* in Hesiod, the festival of the *Eumenides* is taken to represent the new order imposed by Zeus. Such is the implication of the Orphic *Hymn to Zeus*, as it must be, in the Derveni papyrus and also of the ode exalting the Mother in Euripides’ *Helen*.

The Areopagus, Colonus, and Phlya

We turn to Athens, where the names *Eumenides* and *Semnai Theai* “Hallowed Goddesses” are often thought to be concurrent. Three shrines come into question: on the northeast slope of the Areopagus,

the one Aeschylus points to in his play *Eumenides*; beside the hill Colonus on the northwest perimeter of the city, the one Sophocles represents in *Oedipus at Colonus*; and at Phlya farther off at the northeast, in a temple shared by Demeter and other agrarian deities, as described by Pausanias (1.31.4). Now Pausanias says that Athens did not use the name *Eumenides* at all. The same goddesses, he asserts emphatically, are called *Semnai* at Athens and *Eumenides* at Sicyon (2.11.4). It is true that in his account of Athens and Attica he mentions only the *Semnai Theai* of the Areopagus and of Phlya (1.28.1, 31.4) and not the goddesses of Colonus (cf. 1.30.4). Yet he was undoubtedly acquainted with the cult at Colonus, if only from antiquarian literature, in which—in every local variety of which—he was deeply versed. He could not have drawn that contrast between Athens and Sicyon if the goddesses of Colonus were also known as *Eumenides*.

In tragedy, however, the two names *Eumenides* and *Semnai Theai* come to be interchangeable for the goddesses of cult associated with Orestes and also with Oedipus.¹ Aeschylus' *Eumenides* is the earliest surviving source to tell how the *Erinyes* who pursued Orestes were finally persuaded at Athens to become serviceable deities of cult, bestowing fertility and abundance on the city. The title of the play is *Eumenides*, and we are told that the name *Eumenides* was conferred by Athena after Orestes' trial: so the Hypothesis and so Harpocration s.

Εὐμενίδες. Yet in the play the only name mentioned or alluded to is *Semnai Theai* (1041, cf. 383, 1007), and the Areopagus cult was indeed addressed to them alone, as we well know from both inscriptions and extensive antiquarian comment. Since G. Hermann, a lacuna has been generally assumed after line 1027 in Athena's closing speech, which is a summing up of Athens' honors for the goddesses. At this point she very likely announced the cult name *Semnai Theai*, to be echoed at line 1041, and also made it known that this name was equivalent to *Eumenides*.

Sophocles in *Oedipus at Colonus* has a purpose of his own in conflating *Eumenides* and *Semnai Theai* throughout. He uses the one name twice (lines 42, 486), and the other twice (lines 89-90, 458), and the adjective *semnos* twice more (lines 41, 100), and represents the true name as a mystery (lines 43, 129). The question is forced upon us of which name is proper to Colonus: *Eumenides* or *Semnai Theai*. Modern discussion has mostly held that it is *Eumenides*. Why then does Sophocles evoke the other cult(s), the *Semnai Theai* of the Areopagus (and of Phlya)? If however Colonus shares the name *Semnai Theai* with the Areopagus, these goddesses have been equated already, in the story of Orestes, with both the *Eumenides* and the *Erinyes*, and it is highly effective to transfer the equations to the cult at

Colonus and to the story of Oedipus.

The answer has been decided lately by “a Corinthian type roof tile bearing the stamp *Σειμνῶν θεῶν* found re-used as the cover of a 2nd cent. B.C. grave in a cemetery.. .ca. 800-900 m. from the hill Hippios Kolonos” (*SEG* 38.265).² This reuse is much closer to Colonus than to the Areopagus, not to speak of Phlya. Though we do not hear of a building at Colonus, only of a sacred grove, a road ran past which Oedipus had followed from the west. There was perhaps either a stoa at the entrance to the grove or a roofed gate. A building of any kind will have been ruined, and the grove will have been cut down, in the terrible year 200 B.C., when Philip V devastated Attica.³ So nothing remained at Colonus for Pausanias to remark. At the Areopagus shrine, however, he found a tomb of Oedipus (1.28.7, cf. Val. Max. 5.3 ext. 3f)— which leads him to explain that the bones were fetched from Thebes, Sophocles’ version being untrue. Now that the roof tile points to ruin and dispersal, we can see that this tomb was a token replacement.

Euripides in *Orestes*, a play of 408 B.C. set in Argos, repeats the name *Eumenides* insistently (lines 38, 321, 836, 1650) and alludes to *Semnai Theai* only once (410). Perhaps he means to acknowledge the Argive cult. In the earlier, undated *Electra*, also set at Argos, the “goddesses” are studiously left unnamed as the Areopagus trial is predicted at some length (lines 1254-72)— until at the last their cult place on the Areopagus is called *σεμνόν*, a compliment to Athens over Argos.⁴

It is commonly supposed that Athens is the original setting of the story of Orestes’ redemption as associated with a cult of dread goddesses.⁵ But if it were so associated, these ought to be the *Semnai Theai* of the Areopagus and no others. The *Eumenides* of the Peloponnesus would not come into it at all. The equivalence of *Semnai Theai* and *Eumenides* presupposes that Orestes’ redemption was already associated with the latter, as at Tiryns. The argument of the previous chapter is confirmed. It was left to Aeschylus to equate the *Eumenides* with the goddesses of the Areopagus and also to equate the atonement of Orestes, as it must have been, with a trial by the Areopagus court. After line 1027 he explained that the two names were equivalent—but the lines were omitted later because the explanation seemed pointless. After fifty years Euripides and Sophocles were using the names interchangeably on the authority of Aeschylus.⁶

The Role of Women

With the Dorian *Eumenides*, we sometimes see that women are to the fore, as in the procession at Gela and the dedications at Tiryns. In

Athens' cult of the *Semnai Theai*, women officiate and worship almost exclusively.⁷ Their festival of spring is the business of women quite as much as the *Thesmophoria* of autumn.

Women always play the leading role in the worship of the gods, says a determined feminist in Euripides' *Melanippe Captive*, probably Melanippe herself (fr. 494 lines 12-22 Kannicht)—the play is conjecturally dated on metrical grounds between c. 425 and c. 416. Women, she says in illustration, pronounce the oracles of Delphi and Dodona and perform the rites of the *Moirai* and "the nameless goddesses." As rhetoric demands, these are four specific instances, all of them august: Delphi, Dodona, Sicyon, Athens. General customs are not wanted here, nor any single instance of the widespread *Thesmophoria* or *Adônia*, which are not august. Whereas the *Eumenides* of the Peloponnesus are a general custom, the name *Moirai* serves to evoke Sicyon alone, with its famous cult of the two groups together. "The nameless goddesses" can only be the *Semnai Theai* of Athens, who have no definite name, only the title "Hallowed" (*Eumenides* "Of-good-will," though transparent, is a name). Geographically, the four instances are meant to take in the whole of Greece.

The social standing of women is in question in the stories of the tormented matricide Orestes and of old Oedipus and his faithful daughters. Both Aeschylus in *Eumenides* and Sophocles in *Oedipus at Colonus* turn to the cult of the *Semnai Theai*. Both draw a picture of the cult, Aeschylus of the festival procession and Sophocles of a private supplication. As we shall see below, the procession is led by female officiants, and the main body comprises women of all ages. In *Oedipus at Colonus* Ismene withdraws to the innermost part of the grove and prays in hushed tones on behalf of Oedipus (lines 466-507: the ritual is described before it is performed). First she draws fresh water from a spring and pours libation—making use of three bronze bowls provided at the site, winding them with fillets of fresh wool, adding honey to the third bowl. All through the prayer she strews olive boughs on the ground, to a total of three times nine. It is a woman's ritual for which Sophocles has found a place in the dramatic action.⁸

The Festival Date

The *Semnai Theai* dwell in the earth, like the *Eumenides*, and their ritual is similar. It too is suited to the spring. The spring season is strongly intimated by Pausanias' account of Phlya, where the *Semnai Theai* share a temple with Demeter *anêsîdôra* "sending-up-gifts," Zeus *ktêsios* "providing," Athena *tithrônê* "leaping," and *Korê prôtogonê* "first-born" (1.31.4).⁹ All of them save Zeus are named for new growth. Furthermore, Demeter *anêsîdôra* matches Demeter *chloe*

“green shoot” at Colonus, worshipped at the foot of a second hill close by, so that her shrine is “in full view” of the grove of the *Semnai Theai* and of the very spot where Oedipus disappears into the earth (*Oed. Col.* 1600).¹⁰ Rather oddly, the same arrangement is reproduced at Athens. Demeter *chloe* is stationed on the terrace below the Nike bastion in full view of the Areopagus to the west, if not of the very shrine of the *Semnai Theai*, which was on the northeast slope.¹¹ As we shall see in a moment, the procession to the shrine went past Demeter *chloe* and presumably halted for some observance. The shrine is known only from Pausanias and late inscriptions; it may well be a token replacement of the original at Colonus, like the tomb of Oedipus.

The *Semnai Theai* of the Areopagus receive offerings public and private at different times (inscriptions and Aeschylus respectively, as cited below). But the principal event is a yearly festival celebrated at the Areopagus shrine, with a procession that Aeschylus represented in the orchestra of the theater. The festival date is nowhere expressly mentioned—not in Aeschylus or other literary mentions, nor in the Hellenistic decrees that honor the corps of ephebes for marching in escort.¹² Can it be inferred from other evidence?

It is an old mistake, long exposed and given up, to equate Aeschylus’ procession with the Panathenaic procession of midsummer.¹³ A recent proposal must also be rejected. The festival and procession are assigned to 4 *Boêdromiôn* = September, the eve of a sacrifice to Erechtheus, on the showing of Athens’ civic calendar of sacrifice as inscribed in c. 400 B.C.¹⁴ In S. D. Lambert’s authoritative republication of the calendar the letters ϜϞ are newly read in the first fragment of the Ionic-letter side (face A, fr. 1 col. 3 line 3). Traces to the left are probably of numerals, the cost of an offering or of a priestly perquisite; the rest of the column prescribes offerings to Erechtheus and to Athena on the fifth and sixth respectively of an unknown month. As Lambert notes, S. Dow once conjectured that the offerings to Erechtheus, apparently extending to twenty lines, belong to the festival *Genesisia* of 5 *Boêdromiôn*.¹⁵ In the previous line Lambert now proposes to restore the name *Semnai Theai*—as a genitive going with their priestesses or other servitors—on the ground that “death and vengeance” are concerns implicit in the story of Erechtheus and in a festival of ancestors.¹⁶ But Dow’s conjecture was misguided, and this elaboration is doubly so. Instead, the entries probably belong to the month *Skiophoriôn*, since the like-named festival honors both Erechtheus and Athena. Though the *Skiophoria* proper fall on the twelfth, we might expect some observance earlier in the month in the light of Erechtheus’ story. And in fact a biennial section of the calendar gives two observances in the first decad of *Skiophoriôn*, the

first of them to Athena, on two days that are close to these of fr. 1 (face A, fr. 5 col. 1 lines 19-28).¹⁷ The new reading is perhaps to be completed as *σε[λήνην οἱ σε[λήνας*, a cake shaped like the moon, which belongs to the ritual behind Erechtheus' story (Eur. *Erechtheus* fr. 350 Kannicht).¹⁸

To ascertain the date of the festival and procession of the *Semnai Theai*, we must look instead to the stories that serve as aetiology. Every cult of any consequence has its aetiology, a story or stories explaining how it came to be and depicting the main features, including the date. The cult of the *Semnai Theai* comes into several stories played out at the same time in early spring—the stories of Orestes, and of Cylon, and of Epimenides.

Orestes arrived in Athens, a suppliant seeking refuge, in mid-*Anthestêrion*. He was hospitably received, but since he was polluted, the usual way of drinking wine in company—out of a common mixing bowl—had to be renounced. Instead everyone drank wine from individual jugs. Such was the origin of the festival custom called *Choes* “jugs,” which gave its name to the second day of the new-wine festival called *Anthestêria*.¹⁹ This was the twelfth of the month. In another turn to the story Orestes was followed to Athens by *Êrigonê*, daughter of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra, who hoped to see him punished. When he was not, she hanged herself in despair and gave her own name and the name *Aiôra* “swinging rites” to the third day of the same festival, the thirteenth of the month.²⁰ These two events of 12 and 13 *Anthestêrion* must have been followed closely by the disposition of Orestes' case, which is itself the aetiology of the cult and festival of the *Semnai Theai*.

Another legend, but deriving from an actual event, has the same implication. Cylon, a notable of the later seventh century aiming at tyranny, attempted with his partisans to seize the Acropolis. But they were taken captive and mercilessly killed (unless Cylon and his brother escaped by themselves), so as to bring pollution on the city and on the persons most responsible. This terrible episode was long remembered and variously told. Herodotus and Thucydides speak of two junctures, in 507 and 431 B.C., when the pollution suddenly became topical (Hdt. 5.70.2-71, Thuc. 1.126.2-12). The coup was associated with the festival *Diasia* of 23 *Anthestêrion*, honoring Zeus *milichios*. According to Thucydides, Cylon was advised by the Delphic oracle to act on the festival day but mistook it for a different festival of Zeus, the Olympic Games (126.6). We shall see that Thucydides' story is only a variation of an earlier story, that of Herodotus, in which Cylon did act at the festival *Diasia* (chapter 9, pp. 146-49). In any case, this very day was appointed because a great many people were gathered nearby on the festival ground, and Cylon (it is implied)

could count on their support.

The bloody consequence of Cylon's coup is played out at the festival of the *Semnai Theai*. The Cylonians on the Acropolis are forced to yield, whether all at once as in Herodotus or after a protracted siege as in Thucydides. They follow their captors as far as the altars of the *Semnai Theai* on the neighboring hill—to be murdered there. This outcome is invariable, though Herodotus in his very brief report omits to mention the circumstances of the killing. "They also killed some who, as they went past, sat down as suppliants at the altars of the *Semnai Theai*" (Thuc. 126.9). "When they came to the *Semnai Theai* on their way down," a cord they had fastened to Athena's statue so as to maintain a magic bond unexpectedly broke, and they were killed outside the precinct or at the very altars (Plut. *Sol.* 12.1).

Megacles, another eminent Athenian who was chief archon at the time, was held most responsible for the killing—a matter of historical record, inasmuch as his family in the next generation, when the pollution weighed on Athens, were put on trial and condemned ([Arist.] *Ath.* 1, Heracl. *Ath.* 2, Plut. *Sol.* 12.2-4). Accordingly, the story sometimes implicated the rest of the board of archons (Thuc. 1.126.8, Plut. *Sol.* 12.1), though it does not appear that their descendants were singled out like those of Megacles. At the same time, the story says that when the Cylonians sought refuge at the altars of the *Semnai Theai*, "only those were spared who entreated the wives" of the archons (so Plutarch). It is likely that the archons' wives are said to intercede because it is women who serve and worship the *Semnai Theai* and who make up the main body of the festival procession.

According to Herodotus, the Cylonians were taken captive by the chief officers of the *naukrariai*, the territorial units prior to the demes. The attendance of the *Diasia* was so organized; it is another indication that Cylon acted on this very day ([chapter 9](#), p. 148). According to Thucydides, after the coup failed at the time of the Olympic Games, the Cylonians were besieged on the Acropolis for a very long time, six months it might be. This brings us to the season of the *Diasia* once more. Only then are the Cylonians taken captive and killed at the altars of the *Semnai Theai*.

In still another story, Epimenides is summoned to purify Athens from the ensuing pollution. Plutarch ascribes to him sweeping improvements in religion and secular custom and barely mentions "certain entreaties and purifications and cult foundations" (*Sol.* 12.9). It is left to lesser sources to say the obvious. "He founded at Athens the shrine of the *Semnai Theai*" (Diog. Laert. 1.112 = "Lobon of Argos, *On Poets*" fr. 16 CrÖnert).²¹ Or again, he brought sheep both black and white to the Areopagus and allowed them to stray to whatever point each of them might choose, where it was then sacrificed—a

familiar motif—"for which reason one can still find, in Attic *dêmoi*, nameless altars" (Diog. Laert. 1.110). The starting point for the sheep will be the Areopagus shrine of the *Semnai Theai*, here taken as preexisting, so that the remedy is to found filial cults at Colonus and Phlya and perhaps others we do not know of.²²

In sum, the story of Orestes is played out at the *Anthestêria* and the festival of the *Semnai Theai*, the story of Cylon at the *Diasia* and the festival of the *Semnai Theai*, the story of Epimenides at the festival of the *Semnai Theai*. Both *Anthestêria* and *Diasia* fall in the month *Anthestêrion*, the first month of spring, when festivals are frequent and prolonged. The *Anthestêria* take up the eleventh through the thirteenth, the Lesser Mysteries perhaps the fifteenth through the seventeenth (see [chapter 4](#), p. 65), the *Diasia* the twenty-third. If we allow at least a day's interval after the *Diasia* and discount the last days of the month as being occupied by assembly meetings, either the twenty-fifth or the twenty-sixth is left for the festival of the *Semnai Theai*.²³

The Torch-Bearing Procession

The festival, with a procession as the chief public event, is managed by *hieropoioi*, three or more, chosen by the Areopagus Council.²⁴ Demosthenes and Lycurgus were so chosen, the most distinguished persons of the day. Perhaps it was a liturgy, and they bore the cost of the sacrificial victims and other offerings and equipment needed by the officiants and the rest of the processioners. For these details we turn to Aeschylus. At the end of *Eumenides*, Athena prevails on the *Erinyes* with the promise of cult, then creates the shrine on the Areopagus and the procession thereto. The rendering in the orchestra will be faithful. The audience who watched it from their seats on the Acropolis slope had often watched the actual procession make its way along a route close by.

Like other processions to various civic shrines, the procession for the *Semnai Theai* assembled beside the Prytaneion, which with its common hearth is the symbolic center of the city.²⁵ The general location has long been known from the findspots of many relevant inscriptions. The actual remains are very likely those of a large peristyle structure east of the church and courtyard of Ayia Aikaterini, the present Lysicrates Square.²⁶ It thus fronts a public square that has continued as such from ancient to modern times. The southwest corner of the square is the intersection of two ancient streets still partly evident, the north-south Street of Tripods and a road running east to the Gate of Hadrian and west along the south slope of the Acropolis. Here on the south slope it serves only as a processional

way.²⁷ Starting from the square some two hundred m. east of the theater, the procession for the *Semnai Theai* went along the road past the theater, at the level of the topmost seats, to the terrace below the Nike bastion—with a shrine of Demeter *chloê*, at least in later times—then across the saddle between Acropolis and Areopagus by a route no longer apparent and up to the cleft and altars on the northeast slope of the Areopagus.

In the promised cult we hear of women, as it must be, sacrificing in hope of children (lines 834–36, 856–67). The main body of processioners is formed of children, matrons, and old women (1025–27).²⁸ At the head of the procession go *propompoi*, as Aeschylus calls them.²⁹ These are ministers of cult, who carry torches and probably conduct the sacrificial animals, *sphagia* (1005, 1006).³⁰ The exit song of lines 1032–47 is ascribed to them by the manuscripts; they are now revealed as women, since they cry *ololyge* (1043, 1047).³¹ Still other women called *propoloi* carry the Acropolis *xoanon* of Athena *polias*, customary servitors, we may suppose, at the Acropolis shrine (1024–25).³² Together with sacrificial animals and the *xoanon*, torches are mentioned repeatedly as a feature of the procession. The exit song, as we shall see, gives some intimations of the ritual to be conducted within the shrine of the *Semnai Theai*. It is here that the torches are put to use.

Polemon of Ilium, writing at a time when the procession was still faithfully conducted, says that the *genos Hêsychidai* ἔχει τὴν ἡγεμονίαν takes the lead” therein (fr. 49 Preller = schol. Soph. Oed. Col. 489).³³ They can be no other than the *propompoi* of Aeschylus, who take the lead, as was just said, with torches and probably with sacrificial animals.³⁴ It must be that women are drawn from the *genos* to lead the procession and officiate at the shrine. Callimachus is quoted elsewhere for the two lines “and those [the *Semnai Theai*] for whom, quite soberly, the *Hêsychides* as appointed ministers burn up honey cakes” (fr. 681 = schol. Soph. Oed. Col. 489). Here, presumably at the Areopagus shrine, offerings are made to the goddesses by female officiants of the *genos*.

Polemon also describes the preliminary sacrifice of a ram to the eponym *Hesychos*, a hero whose shrine is “beside the *Kylôneion*,” ἐκτὸς τῶν Ἑννέα Πυλῶν outside the Nine Gates.” The procession with its animals in train halts at the Nine Gates for a preliminary sacrifice. The Nine Gates are also mentioned by Cleidemus the Attic chronicler as an attribute—ἐννεάπυλον nine-gated—of the famous *Pelargikon* wall that the Pelasgians constructed around the Acropolis plateau (FGrH 323 F 16).³⁵ As all agree, this was the Mycenaean wall of unhewn polygonal masonry. Since it was replaced in the 460s B.C. by the present wall, Cleidemus (flor. c. 350 B.C.) knew of it only

through mysterious report, which he enhances with further mystery by associating it with the existing Nine Gates and the portentous ritual described by Polemon. The existing Nine Gates are obviously a single monument, with another monument beside it, a memorial of the Cylonians. It can only be a formal entrance to a closed precinct of the *Semnai Theai*. The curious name Nine Gates, for which no practical explanation can be imagined, refers to some ninefold gesture.³⁶

Polemon has observed that the ritual of the *Semnai Theai* is conducted *μετὰ ἡσυχίας* in silence," so that the *genos* and the hero are named for this general practice. The rule of silence obtained at Colonus, too.³⁷ Any words of prayer are hushed, and even so amends are made with a ninefold gesture: Ismene lays down olive boughs throughout her prayer to a total of thrice nine (*Oed. Col.* 483-84). At Athens, the procession may raise a clamorous prayer or song like Aeschylus' exit song; in any case a hushed silence cannot be maintained along the whole route, beginning at the Prytaneion and the public square. It is only at the *Nine Gates*, with its shrine of Mr. Silence, that the rule of silence is acknowledged by sacrifice and by a ninefold gesture. Here, outside the precinct of the goddesses, a male victim is offered to a male hero by the male officiants of the *genos*. It undoubtedly makes a contrast with the business within—but Polemon's account is cut short.

It is excerpted in the scholium to *Oed. Col.* 489, where a supplicant is told to pray softly; the scholiast quotes only as much as is needed to establish the rule of silence. He proceeds as follows: (1) the hushed prayer belongs to the form of ritual

(ἀπὸ τῆς δρωμένης θυσίας) proper to the *Semnai Theai*; (2) it is conducted in silence; therefore, it is in the hands of the line of

Hēsychos (οἱ ἀπὸ Ἡσύχου)(3) Polemon in his work *Against Eratosthenes* says so in these words: ὁ (Hermann: ἄΟ mss)

μετέχει ταύτης τῆς θυσίας the family of well-born persons that takes part in this ritual"; (4) Polemon says thereafter, "Of this procession (there is placed in charge) the *Hēsychidai*, which family in fact has to do with the *Semnai Theai* and takes the lead. And before the ritual they offer a preliminary sacrifice" etc.

In (1) and (2) it is briefly said that the *Semnai Theai* are worshipped in silence by a family named for Silence. In (3) Polemon is cited for details of the family.³⁸ In (4) the following details are quoted—that the family is named "Silence-sons", that they take the lead in the procession, and that they offer a preliminary sacrifice to Mr. Silence. So much is needed to illustrate the silence enjoined on any supplicant. The rest of Polemon's account, about the sequel within the shrine, is omitted. The ritual here is no doubt performed by the torch-bearing female officiants who head the procession, the *Hēsychides*

The Torch-Bearing Rite within the Shrine

At the end of *Eumenides* the command *εὐφαιμίτε* is twice repeated in the exit song so as to indicate the rule of silence (lines 1035, 1039).

And then the command *ὀλολύξατε* is twice repeated, the ritual cry that women raise over a sacrificial victim (1043, 1047); so the silence was broken for a moment. Other elements of the ritual within the shrine are foreshadowed first by Athena's instructions and then by the exit song. The animals (apart from the ram sacrificed beforehand) and other offerings are burnt up and thrown into the cleft (1036–38).⁴⁰ Libations are poured in as well (1044)—these are the only offering mentioned at Colonus.

The libations are joined with torches, *σπονδαὶ . . . ἔνδαιδες*. It must be that torches are thrown in too. In representing the procession, Aeschylus emphasizes torches more than any other element.⁴¹ Yet they are not said to show the way as in darkness—in fact the procession takes place in the full light of day.⁴² They too are offered to the goddesses below. This rite of bearing torches and then throwing them into the cleft is an urgent magic operation. So it is to throw in other offerings, but we are used to it. The *Semnai Theai*, as much as any “chthonian” deities, represent a force of nature that resides beneath the earth, unseen and unpredictable, to be entreated only by such magic.⁴³ When the *Erinyes* are represented in art, mostly at one stage or another of the story of Orestes, their commonest attribute after snakes is torches.⁴⁴ But unlike snakes or the occasional whips, torches do not serve to frighten or torment the guilty. Nor are they needed for searching or pursuing. They can only be imported from the ritual of the *Semnai Theai*.

The torch-bearing rite, with the torches thrown at the last into a cleft or a pit, was also addressed to Persephone as the great goddess who rises from the earth in spring (chapter 6, pp. 101–4). It happens to be reported straightforwardly of a shrine of Demeter and *Korê* in the agora of Argos, which Pausanias singles out for this reason (2.22.3).⁴⁵ Torches, he says, are thrown into a pit in honor of *Korê*. She is accordingly beneath the earth, about to rise in early spring. Pausanias comes next to a shrine of Poseidon *proklystios*, an epithet that recalls how once he flooded the land in anger. Epithet and story point again to early spring, when streams like the Inachus rise in spate and may even cause some damage. Pausanias further says that the rite with torches was instituted by “Nicostratus, a local man,” *anêr epichorios*, which is to say that he was versed in local customs, *ta*

epichoria. He did not of course invent the rite, but transposed it to the agora from its customary rural setting.⁴⁶

We are seldom told of such things by Greek writers, so a Roman parallel is instructive.⁴⁷ Whenever boundary stones, *termini*, are newly planted round a farmer's field, burning torches are cast into each setting hole; so are the burnt remains and blood from a sacrificed animal, and so are vegetable offerings too; everything is covered with a board on which the stone is set (Sic. Flacc. *Grom. Lat.* 1.105 Thulin). This occasional rite is repeated so far as possible at the festival of boundary stones, *Terminalia*, on 23 February, as celebrated by farmers at contiguous fields and more grandly at certain public boundary stones, among them the deified *Terminus* of the Capitol.⁴⁸

Until *Terminus* was deified, the ritual was not addressed to any individual power. Torches, burnt remains, blood, vegetable offerings all have a magical effect on the field enclosed by boundary stones: warming, vivifying, fructifying. Whereas the Greek rite is performed for the earth at large, the Roman one is performed for each field. At the festival there are perforce no open holes and no torches that can only be consigned to them. But the festival date is chosen as the time when fields are most in need of recruitment, when the crops are due to arise from the cold earth.⁴⁹ The *Semnai Theai* as powers of spring are worshipped with the same rite at almost the same moment as the Roman festival.

The Torch-Bearing Rite in Myth

At Argos, says Pausanias, torches are thrown into the pit "in honor of *Korê*." Apart from any explicit mention, myths preserve the spirit of ancient ritual. We remember how Demeter in her Homeric *Hymn* took up torches to go searching for *Korê* and after nine days was joined by Hecate, also bearing torches, so that they continued together, both with torches (lines 47-61). Demeter's torch bearing, or Hecate's, has no further consequence in the narrative. It simply reproduces a ritual action, as do other stages of Demeter's conduct, sitting and fasting and so on. Torches of course have various uses in the worship of Demeter, in parading or reveling, in purifying, in simply lighting up indoor activity.⁵⁰ But such ordinary uses could not inspire the notion of searching for *Korê* with torches.

This part of the story seems to be illustrated only once, on one of the votive plaques from the famous Locrian cult of Persephone.⁵¹ A woman holding a torch in one hand and extending the other in greeting approaches a woman seated on the ground, probably dejected, with a wave of water lapping at her feet.⁵² Two celestial figures overhead, Helios advancing and either Eos or Nyx retreating,

show that it is break of day. In the *Hymn* it is break of day when Hecate with her torches encounters the roaming Demeter with hers (lines 51-52). The parallel is not complete, since Demeter should not be at rest. And no other Locrian plaque among so many can be claimed to depict the Hymn.⁵³ We should think instead of a similar story told locally. Other plaques illustrate local stories that are equivalent aetiologies, as when Persephone is abducted from the flower gathering by a handsome young man, not a bearded uncle.⁵⁴ Two such stories, at Eleusis and at Locri, make it more likely still that an important piece of ritual is in view. If the wave of water represents a freshly flowing stream, the story at Locri also recalls the story at Argos about Poseidon *proklýstios*.

Besides the stories, the ritual gives rise to divine names that evoke torches: *Δηῖώ* and *Δάειρα*. Both names have always seemed enigmatic. But in the new light we have just kindled, the form and meaning of both will seem straightforward.

Demeter in her *Hymn* is called *Δηῖώ* at the very moment she takes up torches and twice thereafter (lines 47, 211, 492).⁵⁵ Our medieval manuscript gives the form *Δηῶ* (and the vocative *Δηοῖ*), which came to be a common byname of Demeter, as if it were a winsome abbreviation.⁵⁶ But it cannot be, and as an original form it defies explanation.⁵⁷ The form *Δηῖώ* occurs twice, as another name of the goddess Rhea, in the Derveni papyrus of c. 340-320 B.C. (XXII 12, 13), which is by far the earliest palaeographic evidence.⁵⁸ Furthermore, this form is essential to the commentator's explanation that *ἐδηῖώθη* "she was ravaged" by intercourse (XXII 13); it was the form generally acknowledged. The papyrus enables us to appreciate the manuscript readings *δηῖω* or *δηι* in Euripides' *Helen*, line 1343, and to supply the correction *Δηιοῖ* (dative), not *Δηοῖ*, the choice of editors since W. Canter. It is *Mêtêr* alias Rhea who is so called by Euripides, this too in agreement with the papyrus.

The form *Δηι* is a feminine *nomen agentis*, in the Ionic dialect of epic poetry, of the verb *δαίω* "kindle," applied to one who kindles a torch. It may very well originate with Demeter's *Hymn*. It is no doubt original with the *Hymn* to describe Demeter as taking up torches, and to set Hecate beside her as the archetypal torch bearer, so as to dramatize the search for *Korê*, the grain maiden. As we saw ([chapter 6](#), pp. 102-3), it is original with the *Hymn* to equate *Korê* and Persephone, which gives the outline of the story. As for the connexion with *Mêtêr* / Rhea in the Derveni papyrus and in Euripides, we shall come to it below in the matter of Orphic genealogy.

The divine name *Δάειρα* or *Δαῖρα* is attested for Eleusis and for agrarian cults at Paeania and the Tetrapolis of Marathon. Ancient sources dispute the etymology together with the identity of this

obscure figure.⁵⁹ According to the only view that is avowedly based on cult, she is named for *δαῖς* “torch” either because her mysteries are celebrated with torches or because she carries a torch herself, and this “among the Athenians,” whether the reference is to Eleusis or to Attica at large.⁶⁰ It is another feminine agent of *δαίω*.⁶¹

There is some documentary evidence for the name—meager and scattered but remarkably consistent. In the calendar of the Tetrapolis, *Daira* receives a gravid victim in the month *Gamêliôn* = January, in earnest of the laden ears to come (*IG* 2² 1358 A 2 lines 11-12).⁶² At Eleusis too, as appears from the Lycurgan record of hide-moneys, *Daeira* is worshipped in or about the same month (*IG* 2² 1496 line 103).⁶³ In the calendar of Paeania, as laconic as any, *Daira* is the only deity named beside an offering (*IG* r³ 250 A r5-r7). Now the calendar gives us the festival series *Prêrosia*, *Chloaia*, *Antheia*, *Skira* that extends from the sowing to the harvest (A 15-32), and she is named at the first of them, beside an offering at the local *Eleusinion*. A subsequent offering might be hers without being so labeled, especially the offering at the *Chloaia*, which is likewise at the *Eleusinion* (A 26-28). The *Chloaia* “sprouting [rites]” are the next seasonal event after the sowing, the first appearance of green shoots in winter. *Gamelion* would be an average date, and the festival *Chloaia* happens to be attested at Eleusis (*IG* 2² 949 line 7), like the goddess *Daeira*.⁶⁴

The Paeania inscription, not the calendar but a longer list of duties and perquisites on the same stone, also names a “priestess of Hecate,” the only priesthood named beside the respective duties and perquisites (B 33-35; cf. B 14-16).⁶⁵ The occasion is in fact the festival *Chloaia* (B 30-32, cf. B 13). This is perhaps the only mention of Hecate in an agrarian context in any Attic inscription.⁶⁶ It can only be *Daira* under a more imposing literary name, that of torch-bearing Hecate. The list of duties and perquisites was enacted by the deme assembly at the time of the inscription, “a. 450-430”; the calendar is an older record.

We owe to Pollux a further record of cult (r .35). *Daeira* gives her name to one of three lesser functionaries, *iakchagôgos*, *kurotrophos*, *daeiritês*, who come at the end of his long list of Eleusinian priesthoods.⁶⁷ To judge from the first of them, they are all placed in charge of statues used in public ceremony. *Iakchos* represents a male torch bearer, *Daeira* a female one. As for *kurotrophos*, her name or title does not lend itself to a compound denoting the functionary, but he is implicit in the series. She declares herself another emblematic figure, a nurse, even though we cannot say what she looked like. Since *Iakchos* belongs to the grand procession of the Mysteries, and *Daeira* to the *Chloaia* of *Gamêliôn*, the nurse will come later, at a festival celebrating the new crop, sometimes imagined as the infant *Plutos*—it

might be either at the earing of the grain or at the harvest.

Accordingly, *Daeira* or *Daira* is a minor goddess of Attica who personifies a torch-bearing rite at the festival *Chloaia* of the month *Gamêliôn*. “They regard her as inimical to Demeter,” says an antiquarian notice, “for when sacrifice is offered to her, Demeter’s priestess is not present, and she is not even allowed to taste the sacrificial portions.”⁶⁸ *Daeira* is a sister of *Styx*, or the wife of *Hades* dwelling beside the *Styx*, or a warder of *Persephone* appointed by *Hades*.⁶⁹ Or it is only another name for *Persephone* herself while she is beneath the earth.⁷⁰ Or, in a different story, this is the wife of *Eumolpus* and mother of *Immaradus*—she is thus enrolled among the Thracian contingent at *Eleusis*, harbingers of winter cold and wet.⁷¹ She can be described as the very principle of wetness, ἡ ὑγρὰ οὐσία.⁷² It is a critical time, with the new crop still invisible, with both *Demeter* and *Persephone* away.

The Torch-Bearing Rite in Orphic Genealogy

Dêiô and *Hecate* are two embodiments of the torch-bearing rite. They are both presented as such in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*, probably for the first time. *Demeter* is called *Dêiô* and is joined by *Hecate* as she searches for *Persephone*. This became the usual version, together with other details of the *Hymn*. But Orphic poetry took a different view, of *Dêiô* and of *Hecate* as of other details. It did so in successive works over long ages, down to the *Rhapsodies*.

1. The first instance forms the conclusion of the Orphic poem cited and interpreted by an allegorical commentator in the *Derveni papyrus*. It has not been recognized that *Dêiô*, alias *Rhea*, bears *Hecate* to *Zeus*. In the last preserved lines of the last column the commentator quotes the poem as saying that *Zeus* “wished to mingle in love with his own mother,” i.e. *Rhea* (XXVI 814; cf. 1-2). This was preceded by the line “when the mind of *Zeus* had devised everything” (XXV 13-14), so that the mating with *Rhea* has a cosmic purpose. Even earlier the commentator gave the names of seven goddesses—*Gê*, *Mêtêr*, *Rhea*, *Hêrê*, *Dêmêtêr*, *Hestia*, *Dêiô*—while asserting that they were all the same (XXII 7-12) and explaining further that *Dêiô* is so called from being ravaged by intercourse and that *Rhea* is so called because many creatures “flow” from her (XXII 12-16). The other five are mentioned only because they appear in other Orphic *Hymns* and serve to show that *Orpheus* wisely employs a variety of names variously suited to the limited perceptions of ordinary men.⁷³ It is *Rhea* alone who is taken by *Zeus* in the final lines, being called *Dêiô* at the same time. Now it is generally supposed that *Zeus* forced himself on *Rhea* after she had taken the name *Demeter* so as to beget *Persephone*, and with

the prospect of forcing himself on Persephone so as to beget Dionysus.⁷⁴

If so, we arrive all at once at this celebrated doctrine of late antiquity, as reported by Athenagoras of a certain Orphic theogony (*Orph.* fr. 88 Bernabé / 58 Kern) and by Proclus and others of the *Rhapsodies* (*Orph.* frs. 206, 276 Bernabé/145 Kern). It is a doctrine that has left no discernible trace in earlier literature. And the Derveni commentator does *not* say that his poem equates Rhea and Demeter.⁷⁵ And as cited and interpreted, his poem stops far short of the full sequence of events. Some are half inclined to postulate a second papyrus roll or more with the rest of the story.⁷⁶ This idea is impossible to credit, since the existing roll has reached a definite conclusion, the union desired by Zeus, and the commentator has anticipated so much and no more. Nor should we suppose that the poem is a full-dress theogony. The commentator speaks only of various *Hymns* and of a corpus of *Hymns*. The forty-odd lines we have make a very plausible *Hymn to Zeus*: it begins with a summons to worshippers (VII 8-11), and tells a connected story of how Zeus came to power, mating at the last with a goddess of the former generation, and pauses in the middle to extol the god in hymnic style with some resounding predicates (XVI 12-XIX).

Whatever the genre, the poem ends with the union of Zeus and Rhea. Zeus in his cosmic purpose forces himself on his mother, who has also the title *Dêiô*. And of course she bears offspring according to his purpose, in a line or lines we do not have—at least in the papyrus. A matching line is preserved elsewhere.

The scholiast on Apollonius, *Argon.* 3.467, quotes “the *Orphika*” for the following line (*Orph.* fr. 400 i Bernabé / 41 Kern):

καὶ τότε δὴ Ἑκάτην Δηὸν τέκεν εὐπατέριαν

And then *Dêô* bore Hecate to a fine father.

The father is Zeus, and the mother is said to be *Demêtêr*, i.e. *Dêô*. The scholiast on Theocritus, *Id.* 2.12, ascribes the same view to Callimachus, as if he had drawn on this Orphic source (*Callim.* fr. 466 = *Orph.* fr. 400 ii Bernabé / 42 Kern).⁷⁷ Now *Demêtêr* as mother is surprising, indeed impossible. Hecate and Persephone are then full sisters and in consequence somehow of separate encounters between Zeus and *Demêtêr*. It is a palpable misunderstanding. For the scholiasts, and perhaps for Callimachus before them, *Dêô* = *Demêtêr*. But in the Orphic poem of the Derveni papyrus, *Dêiô* = Rhea. And Zeus mates with her, and she bears offspring. So the line quoted by Apollonius’ scholiast comes at the end of our poem, or rather of its narrative section, if it is a hymn. Zeus + Rhea / *Dêiô* > Hecate. Since

the mother's nickname points to torches and the daughter is an archetypal torch bearer, Zeus' cosmic purpose is to perpetuate the torch-bearing rite.⁷⁸

2. A second instance is the source behind the choral ode of Euripides' *Helen*, already mentioned. Rhea is substituted for Demêtêr in the story of the search. The source is no doubt another Orphic hymn, a hymn to either "Rhea" or "MêTêR," two common literary names for the same goddess.

MêTêR, says Euripides, went searching for her "daughter," i.e. *Korê*, and inflicted blight and famine everywhere until appeased by Zeus (lines 1301-52). The emphasis is all on the *persona* of the elder goddess, with her chariot drawn by wildcats, her habitat of mountain peaks and springs, her ecstatic ritual of moaning pipes and tambourines. The ritual is in fact bestowed by Zeus as the means of appeasing her. As he does so, he also bestows the title *Dêiô*, for which, as we saw above, the proper spelling is uniquely preserved in the manuscript tradition of this play. Zeus addresses his emissaries, the Charites, just as he sends emissaries to Demêtêr, several in succession, in the Homeric *Hymn*. "Go, hallowed (*σεμναί*) Charites, go, and for her who is angry about her daughter, for *Dêiô*, shriek, aye shriek (*ἐξαλλάξατ' ἀλαλαῖ*)" (1341-44). The title *Dêiô* will come from the Orphic poem. At the same time, by means of the epithet and the shrieking of the Charites, Euripides evokes Athens' cult of the *Semnai Theai*, in which the torch-bearing ritual and the *ololyge* of women are conspicuous.

3. The last instance is the Orphic theogony known to Plato. It presented Hecate instead of Rhea / *Dêiô* as an elder goddess who embodies the torch-bearing rite before it is embodied in her offspring in the time of the Olympians. So much emerges from a chain of inference that starts with the poet Euphorion and the genealogy he propounds for the *Semnai Theai* of Colonus. Euphorion is allusive, and his meaning must be puzzled out.

The scholiast to *Oed. Col.* 681 quotes the following lines in illustration of the mystic flower narcissus, as mentioned in the choral ode praising Colonus (*Coll. Alex.* fr. 94):

Onward they brought him, over the destined path
To the white hill, the frightful granddaughters of Phorcys,
The *Eumenides*, their tresses garlanded with the narcissus.

Oedipus is led to Colonus as if he were a sacrificial victim; the goddesses lead him as if they were the ritual officiants, wearing garlands of flowers. The genealogy is unexpected, whether the *Eumenides* or the *Erinyes* are in view. In the second line the kinship term *θυγατριδαί* means more exactly "daughters of a daughter."

The goddesses were born by a daughter of Phorcys.

A. Meineke, supposing that the *Erinyes* are in view (they are certainly evoked by the epithet *δασπλήτες* “frightful”), took the daughter to be Night.⁷⁹ But Night cannot be later in the scheme of things than Phorcys. Hesiod puts her almost at the beginning, like the very Earth, with a large progeny of mostly hateful creatures. Orpheus, even wiser, puts her before all else, a pronouncement famous from the Classical period to the end of antiquity (Eudemus fr. 150 Wehrli / *Orph.* fr. 20 Bernabe / 28 Kern, cf. *P. Derv.* cols. X-XIII). To be sure, Bacchylides gives her Hecate as daughter, a goddess otherwise of a later generation (fr. 1b). But this is only for a momentary effect, while he invokes Hecate herself as “torch bearer”; it has no further significance. Learned Euphorion expects us to recall a definite genealogy.

In any case, it is not the primordial *Erinyes* but the goddesses of cult at Colonus, the *Semnai Theai* alias the *Eumenides*, whom Euphorion has in view: the genealogy pertains to them.⁸⁰ In Orphic poetry their mother is Persephone (see chapter 6, pp. 101-5). In the *Rhapsodies*, in the Orphic *Hymns*, and in *Aeneid* Book 7, Persephone bears them to Hades. As a prophecy in the *Rhapsodies*, she was meant to bear them to Apollo. We may further conjecture that she originally, as in the local belief of Selinus, bore them to Zeus. Perhaps Euphorion traces their line through the mother just because the paternity varied. If late sources are constant in naming Persephone, it is unlikely that a different mother was ever proposed. But what of Phorcys as father of Persephone?

Phorcys too has a role in Orphic genealogy, already known to Plato: he belongs to the Titan generation, together with *Kronos* and *Rhea* (*Tim.* 40e = *Orph.* fr. 24 Bernabé / 16 Kern). Plato’s account also shows that *Oceanus* and *Tethys* had been subtracted from the Titan generation so as to constitute a previous generation by themselves. Phorcys and probably *Dione* took their place, so that the Titans are fourteen in the compendious *Rhapsodies*, these two and the regular twelve (*Orph.* frs. 149 iv, 179 Bernabé / 109, 114 Kern). A daughter of Phorcys, like other Titan daughters, may be taken to wife by an Olympian of the same generation, like Zeus or Hades.

Phorcys is in origin an Old Man of the Sea, whom Hesiod put to use as the parent-in-chief of fabulous monsters, mating him with the eponymous “Monster” *KêTô* (*Theog.* 270-336). In Homer he is father of the nymph on whom Poseidon begot his dear son Polyphemos (*Od.* 1.68-73),^a a genealogical sally quite different in spirit—Hesiod’s lineage of monsters have nothing to do with the sea. Accordingly, Homer and Hesiod are blended when Phorcys is made the father of the marine monster Scylla, a fiction we find in *Acusilaüs* and again in *Apollonius*

(FGrH 2 F 42, *Argon.* 4.828–29). The mother, Phorcys' wife, is Hecate—which is very strange. The fiction, it would seem, is inspired not only by Homer and Hesiod but also by another authority who made Phorcys and Hecate a conjugal pair. Orpheus would be such an authority: i.e. Plato's Orphic poem with Phorcys as Titan.

An Orphic genealogy in which Phorcys mates with Hecate is likely to be one in which Persephone is their daughter. Persephone is normally the daughter of Zeus and Demêtêr, a relationship she first acquired through being equated with *Korê* in the Homeric *Hymn to Demêtêr*. But the *BibliothêKê* of [Apollodorus] markedly dissents. Whereas Hesiod in listing the six wives of Zeus and their respective offspring includes Demêtêr and Persephone (*Theog.* 901–23), the *BibliothêKê* in an equivalent list of six includes Styx and Persephone (1.3.1 [1.13]).

In the *BibliothêKê* the opening account of divine genealogy appears to draw both on Hesiod and on an Orphic theogony that stood at the head of the Epic Cycle as a creation of the Hellenistic period.⁸¹ This was not the Orphic poem known to Plato but a later one. Here the goddess Styx bore Persephone to Zeus. Persephone, as we saw, is the great goddess of the burgeoning of spring, herself a stream of water “pouring forth,” the literal meaning of the name ([chapter 6](#), p. 103). A better mother could not be found. Styx is the ideal spring and stream of icy water, cold as death, welling up from the realm below.⁸² So the Orphic poem is faithful to the outlook of cult, and since Persephone, when she is not Demêtêr's daughter *Korê*, is a power equal to the Olympians, it is appropriate for her mother to be a goddess of a former generation, such as Styx.⁸³

It is equally appropriate for Persephone's father to be a Titan, as in the earlier Orphic poem. And this poem too is faithful to the outlook of cult by making Hecate the mother. Torch-bearing Hecate embodies the torch-bearing rite of spring. Persephone first, then the *Eumenides* descend from this embodiment of the rite. Such is the point of the genealogy alluded to by Euphorion.

Semnai Theai and *Eumenides*

The *Semnai Theai*, like the *Eumenides*, are goddesses of fertility dwelling in the earth, to be summoned only by urgent magic rites. They are concealed and uncertain in a way the gods on high are not. We see and understand the sky and the world around us, but not the forces beneath, though they are just as powerful. All of them are frightening, these sisterhoods and the parent deities Persephone and Zeus *milichios*. The ritual and the thank-offerings addressed to them do not stand out amid the pageantry and festivity of civic religion. The

same can often be said, but with notable exceptions, of the two great deities of staple crops, Demêtêr and Dionysus. All the deities just named are liable to neglect in the literary and monumental pantheon that constitutes Greek religion of the Classical and Hellenistic periods. The Orphics as a fundamentalist sect make up for the neglect.

1. Lloyd-Jones (1990), Henrichs (1994, 37–40, 44, 47–51).

2. Henrichs (1994, 49) cites the tile as confirming the “official” name, yet thinks of the other name, *Eumenides*, as “unofficial, demotic, and at the same time Panhellenic.”

3. The destruction of sanctuaries in the countryside was so thorough and irreparable that most of them disappear from the record: Mikalson (1998, 189–94).

4. At *Iph. Taur.* 944 and in *Melanippe Captive* fr. 494 line 18 Kannicht, both earlier than 414 B.C., the *Semnai Theai* of the Areopagus are “the nameless goddesses,” as also in one version of Epimenides’ purification of Athens, mentioned below.

5. But Lardinois (1992, 317–18) notes the possibility that Orestes had already been associated with one or another of the Peloponnesian cults of the *Eumenides*.

6. Demosthenes in 352 B.C. exalts the Areopagus by recalling the judgment “for the *Eumenides* and Orestes” (23 *Aristocr.* 66). By this time, it was the name generally used in the story.

7. O. Müller observed long ago, in his edition of the *Eumenides*, that the cult of the *Semnai Theai* was largely in the hands of women; in this as in all else he was opposed by Hermann; but Müller was right, as Preller affirmed in his edition of Polemon. Even so, the observation has been neglected.

8. See further Dillon (2002, 71). Dillon gives full measure to the *Semnai Theai* in his study of women’s role in Greek religion, an exception to the general neglect.

9. As to Athena’s epithet, *τιθρωνή < θρώσχω* seems the only feasible etymology.

10. For the topography in relation to the dramatic action see Jebb’s introduction to the play, pp. xxx–xxxviii (rev. ed., Cambridge 1899).

11. See Beschi (1968, 513 fig. 1, 517–18, 526) and Robertson (2005, 69 fig. 5, 71).

12. Neither Pfuhl (1900, 97–99) nor Deubner (1932, 214) gives any date or season.

13. A. Mommsen suggested this in 1864, for no good reason. He was refuted by Toepffer (1889, 175) and yielded entirely in 1898 by saying nothing about it in a treatment of the Panathenaic festival that extends to 120 pages (indeed, his book of 530 pages contains no mention of the *Semnai Theai*), but the suggestion passed like a germ into commentaries on Aeschylus and persists to this day (see Weaver [1996] with bibliography).

14. Lambert (2002a, 76, 78–79, 81–82; 2002b, 362, 368). Besides other objections, this would jostle the great procession for Artemis *agrotera* on 6 *Boedromion*.

15. The conjecture has been generally favored. It is Erichthonius, however, not Erechtheus, who is the earth-born offspring of Athena entrusted to the Cecropids and therefore a common ancestor. Though Xenophon confused them, they are quite dissimilar. Athenians at large are called *Erechtheidai*, *Thêseidai*, and the like only in the sense of being true sons of these mighty heroes. Otherwise, Erechtheus is not a general ancestor; he belongs to either the *Eteobutadai* or the tribe *Erechthêis*.

16. “Death and vengeance [are] themes which were prominent in myths

surrounding Erechtheus and his family” (Lambert 2002a, 79). This is over-stated. Poseidon in his role as enemy champion takes vengeance on Erechtheus, but Athena in her role as champion of Athens redresses the misfortune. Lambert thinks also of *Epops* of Erchia, honored in the deme on 5 *Boedromion*, as a general ancestor who implies another local celebration of the *Genesia*. But the hero *Epops* receives just the same anxious offerings as Zeus *epopetes* on 25 *Metageitnion*, and both resemble the widely attested Zeus *epopsios*, active at the same season. They all, and perhaps the hero *Eropeus* of Sicyon as well, are “watching” deities who in customary fashion punish wickedness with bad weather. See Robertson (1999a, 73–75).

17. According to the space available, the date in line 20 is the second, fourth, fifth, or seventh, and that in line 28 is the third, sixth, eighth, or ninth: Lambert (2002b, 375–76). Robertson (2004, 135–36) discusses these entries as they relate to those of the preceding month, which are likewise addressed to Athena.

18. An offering of mere cakes is not mentioned otherwise in the fragments of the civic calendar, only animals, wine, oil, honey, barley, Owool. But Euripides speaks impressively of a great many such cakes, made as it seems from the first ripe ears of wheat.

καί μοι—πολὴν γὰρ πελανὸν ἐκπέμπεις δόμων— / φράσον σελήνας τὰσδε
πυρίμου χλόης

. They are *aparchai* on a scale deserving notice.

19. Eur. *Iph. Taur.* 949–57, Phanodemus *FGrH* 325 F 11, and so on.

20. The prosecution is variously described as “those who came from Sparta” (Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F 169a/ 323a F 22a), “Aegisthus’ daughter Erigone” (*Marm. Par. FGrH* 239 A 25), either “Tyndareos” or “Erigone daughter of Aegisthus and Clytaemestra” ([Apollod.] *Bibi.* Epit. 6.25), “Erigone daughter of Aegisthus and Clytaemestra, together with her grandfather Tyndareos” (*Et. Magn.* s. *Aiōra*); the aetiological consequence is reported only by *Et. Magn.* She is more likely than not the subject of Sophocles’ *Erigone* (frs. 235–36 Radt), inasmuch as Erigone daughter of Icarius, whose roaming and suicide likewise explain the names *Aletis* and *Aiōra* for the festival day, is not heard of until Hellenistic times: so Radt and also Lloyd-Jones, Loeb ed. (1996, 101). The Argive Erigone has a brother “Aletes,” whom Orestes killed at Argos even as he spared the sister, in a melodramatic tale known only from Hyginus (*Fab.* 122). Stobaeus quotes sententious fragments of a tragedy *Ολεστρο* unworthily ascribed to Sophocles (now *TrGF* adesp. ib, a-g), yet another incarnation of the festival day, unless it is a different Aletes altogether, such as Corinth’s Dorian founder (Snell and Kannicht think rather of a descriptive title “Offender,” an odd choice for a tragedy). The relationship of these stories cannot be made out on present evidence, but since the festival nomenclature *Erigone*, *Aiōra*, *Aletis* is distinctly Attic (and Ionic), tragedy must be suspected for them all.

21. “Lobon of Argos is a shadowy figure of uncertain date”: West (1983, 44). Or more likely, he is a *Schwindelautor*: Fehling (1985, 35–36).

22. The straying animals are each to be offered *τῷ προσήκοντι θεῷ* “to the appropriate god,” but this is only for the sake of the story. “Nameless altars” can belong to none but “the nameless goddesses” (see note 4). The two stories about Epimenides are treated at length and shown to be equivalent by Henrichs (1991, 161–79; 1994, 35–39) and by Johnston (1999, 279–83).

23. As to the assembly meetings see Mikalson (1975, 116–21).

24. The evidence for the number is conflicting; it is cited and discussed by Wallace (1985, 109–10) and by Parker (1996, 130, 249–50, 298).

25. Processions expressly said to start from the Prytaneion are listed by Robertson (1998a, 299). The custom is not in view at Arist. *Pol.* 6, 1322b 26–29, as Schmalz (2006, 34n4) supposes.

26. So Schmalz (2006, 45–61), cf. Papadopoulos (2003, 284). A portion of the

west colonnade long survived from the final Roman rebuilding; other portions and traces of the rooms behind it and of a gateway at the west end of the south wall, close to the square, were uncovered in limited excavations of 1911, of the 1960s, and of 1982; together they show that the plan was unchanged and the use was constant from Late Archaic or Early Classical through Roman, a record that suits only the Prytaneion—and which cannot be claimed for any other Athenian building known to archaeologists. “For the excavators” of the 1960s, says Schmalz (2006, 57), “the most exciting result... was the discovery” that the dining rooms, as they appear to be, overlie a deep deposit of excellent black-figure ware, mainly drinking cups, “the debris of repeated large-scale dining activity dating to the Peisistratid era”—i.e. to the first days of Peisistratus himself, inasmuch as the date is mid-sixth century.

27. See Robertson (1998b, 285 fig. 1, 290–95; 2005, 69 fig. 5, 70–74).

28. After line 1027 comes the lacuna where the names *Semnai Theai* and *Eumenides* must have stood. It is sometimes thought that “men” were also mentioned as processioners, after children, matrons, and old women. This is quite unlikely, but if they were, the order can only mean that they were the least important.

29. Elsewhere, but not here, *πρόπομπος, προπέμπω* are Aeschylean words applied to various persons and things that are solemnly to the fore. The Hypothesis to *Eumenides* includes *propompoi* among the persons of the drama, and Athena avowedly instructs them first (1005–7), then turns to the host of citizens (1010–13).

30. Pfuhl (1900, 98–99) supposes that the *hieropoioi*, the archons, and assorted magistrates all marched at the head of the procession. Aeschylus’ portrayal is much against this. It is also much against Lambert’s supposition that *kanephoroi* or a *kanephoros* took part (2002c, 81–82). He restores *Agora* 16 no. 218 lines 13–14 to say that a girl shall serve in the [procession of the *Semnai Theai*]. It would be a long shot in any case (cf. *SEG* 50.147, 52.110).

31. They are feminine according to a marginal note on 1032, but this will be a mere inference, as A. H. Sommerstein remarks (on 1032–47, Cambridge 1989).

32. Just as Athena goes ahead in the orchestra, so her statue goes ahead in real life. The old *xoanon* is carried to the Areopagus so as to witness the proceedings—to be thus fortified or gratified, a magical idea. The Cylonians, we recall, withdraw from the Acropolis to the Areopagus while keeping hold of a cord attached to the *xoanon*, another magical idea that may be intended as aetiology. Note in passing that these servitors, often promoted to include a priestess of Athena, figure largely in discussions that conjure with the Panathenaic procession (see note 13). Among those that do not, F. Bomer, *RE* 21.2 (1952) 1956 s. *Pompa* 1, ascribes “the priestess of Athena” to “the regular cult” of the *Semnai Theai* (but some of Aeschylus’ details he dismisses as a fiction, oddly comparing Aristophanes’ parody of a cult foundation at the end of *Plutos*). Brown (1984, 274–75) somehow makes out that the attendants are heading for the Acropolis, not the Areopagus.

33. The procession has a certain prominence in ephebic decrees of the middle Hellenistic period: *Hesperia* 15 (1946) 199–201 no. 40 lines 16–17, 24 (1955) 228–

32 line 26. *SEG* 26.98 lines 9–10 (lege *(lege ἐπόμπευσ]αν δὲ καὶ τὰς πομπὰς τὴν τε τῶν Σεμνῶν θ[ε-]/[ῶν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας κτλ]*).

34. Toepffer (1889, 174–75) and Parker (1996, 299) both declare that Aeschylus neglects the *Hesychidai* in favor of the citizen body. Toepffer quotes these very words of Polemon and finds no correspondence with the text of Aeschylus! The *genos*, he says, are subsumed in the host of citizens who are said to “lead” the procession (1010–11)—no, it is rather that the citizens “lead” the metic goddesses to their new home.

35. In telling how the Pelasgians “leveled the Acropolis” Cleidemus plainly means the plateau and hence the circuit wall at the top, not the outwork below that shielded the west entrance, which is the other meaning of *Pelargikon*. So Cleidemus’ Nine Gates must not be associated with the outwork, as they are by Iakovidis (1962, 184–88). It is true that the outwork below extended eastward on the south side to the far limit of the sanctuary of Asclepius and was entered here through a gate that is referred to both in stories and in documents and is very likely depicted in the relief scene commemorating the establishment of Asclepius’ sanctuary: see Robertson (1998a, 292–95). Our procession like others passed through this gate, but it has no ritual significance.

36. The *Eumenides* themselves are nine in number according to the *Rhapsodies*, at least in Demeter’s prediction to *Kore* (*Orph.* fr. 284 Bernabé / 194 Kern). But the *Semnai Theai* of the Acropolis are not so regarded—antiquarians including Polemon make them either two or three by counting the cult statues (cf. Toepffer [1889, 171n3] and Jacoby on Phylarchus *FGH* 81 F 82).

37. *Soph.Oed. Col.* 82 (ἐν ἡσυχίῳ), 131–33, 156–157, 488–89.

38. Since Polemon is combating Eratosthenes, he first identifies, then enlarges on, the point at issue, which seems to be how the cult was managed: by a family of well-born persons, more precisely by the family *Hesychidai*. OM οἱ εὐπατρίδαι are Athens’ priestly families, who have this office in virtue of descending from a noble ancestor and are typically so named, e.g. *Eteobutadai*, *Lykomidai*, *Eumolpidai* (typically, not uniformly; functional and local names do not change the general picture). It is better not to capitalize *eupatridae*; when so used, it is not a term for any caste or class. Hermann’s correction of οὐ το ὄ, duly accepted by Preller, is obvious and essential. The word was changed by a copyist to make a sentence instead of a phrase, but the scholiast quotes only a phrase so as to introduce the *Hesychidai*.

39. The *xoanon* of Athena is carried in procession to witness the ritual. Does Athena stand beside the worshippers or at some remove? On the northeast brow of the Areopagus, directly above the unlocated shrine of the *Semnai Theai*, the imprint of a small temple has lately been discerned, of the size and shape of the temple of Athena *nike* and of Athena’s *Palladion* temple at the Ilissus (Korres [1996, 113n70], Goette [2001, 22, 56–57]). Those temples both house a *xoanon* of Athena; at the *Palladion* temple the image is removed each year so as to witness a ceremony elsewhere (see Robertson [1996b, 392–408; 2001]—the Ilissus temple is commonly misas- signed to Artemis or *Meter*). Perhaps then the Areopagus temple marks the spot from which Athena observes the ritual of the *Semnai Theai*. It is likely to be a little later than Aeschylus’ play.

40.

γᾶς ὑπὸ κεύθεσιν ὠκυγίοισιν / τιμαῖς καὶ θυσίαις περίσепта τύχοιτε
“In earth’s primeval depths be ye rewarded with honors and sacrifices.” The text in 1037–38 is according to Hermann and Wakefield and as agreed by three recent editors, Page, Sommerstein, and West. It is within the earth, the usual destination of *sphagia*, that the goddesses receive and enjoy the sacrifices.

41. Athena proposes to reveal the underground chambers “by the holy light of these *propompoi*” (1005–6). “Let the lustre of fire move off” is the starting signal (1029). The goddesses are conducted by the torches (1022–23); they are gladdened by the torches (1041–42). Finally, the torches go into the earth with the libations (1044).

42. Despite Pfuhl (1900, 98), it is certain that the procession and the ensuing ritual do not take place at night. In *Eumenides* and in *Oedipus at Colonus*, in all the antiquarian comment, nothing is ever said of nighttime ritual, though it would suit

the *Erinyes* perfectly. Aeschylus would be guilty of an extraordinary oversight in the dramatic action. Did Orestes' trial last so long that day wore into night, without anyone saying so?

43. On two occasions in the year 362/i B.C., on concluding a peace treaty with several Peloponnesian states and on sending a cleruchy to Potidaea, the Athenians vowed in case of success to offer sacrifices and to conduct processions to selected civic deities (IG 2² 112 lines 6–12, 114 lines 6–12). Only the Twelve Gods (scil. the Olympians) and the *Semnai Theai* are common to both occasions, being named together—they are either preceded by Zeus *olympios*, Athena *polias*, and Demeter and *Kore*, the very grandest cults at Athens, or followed by the hero Heracles. Are they not chosen, the Twelve Gods and the *Semnai Theai*, as collectives of gods on high and of gods below, respectively? (According to Parker [2005c, 406], the *Semnai Theai* are included so as “to threaten the Athenians with punishment should they break their vow,” but this is neither the sense nor the spirit of the two passages.)

44. H. Sarian, *LIMC* 3 (1986) Erinys 4, 9–11, 19, 23, 26, 31–32, 35, 45, 55, 57–58, 61, 66, 71–73, 75, 80–82, 85–86, 90, 92, 94–95, 99–100, 102–3, 107, 109, iii.

45. It is a rite “completely different” from rites generally performed at a pit, *bothros*, as Ekroth (2002, 68) remarks. But throwing down torches in the spring is not to be associated, as she also suggests, with the notorious rites of autumn performed at Demeter's *megaron*, nor is it so associated by Burkert or Clinton in the studies she cites. For those rites see Robertson (1996d).

46. The Orphic *Hymn to Night*, no. 3, is headed *θυμίαμα δαλούς*, presumably meaning that pinewood, the material of torches, is to be burnt as her special incense. It is only a fanciful gesture.

47. It is mentioned *inter alia* by Frazer on Paus. 2.22.3.

48. For sources and discussion see Wissowa (1912, 136–38), F. Boomer on Ov. *Fast.* 2.639ff., Latte (1960, 64), A. Degrassi, *InscrItal* 13.2 pp. 414–15.

49. Varro held that this was once the last day of the year (*Ling. Lat.* 6.13), as also that the offerings were once of vegetables only (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.74.2, Plut. *Num.* 16.2–3, *Quaest. Rom.* 15, 267c), but both points are hypothetical.

50. The use of torches at Eleusis and elsewhere is fully discussed by N. J. Richardson on *H. Cer.* (Oxford 1974) under several heads—in purification (25, 166–67, 212–13, 232), within the *telesterion* (26–27), in the Iacchus procession and in a nighttime revel that followed (165, 171), even in a possible enactment of Demeter's search, which will be secondary (24–25, 162, 165). Torches are about the commonest attribute in art of both Demeter and *Kore*; no doubt they evoke each of these activities from time to time.

51. Prückner (1968, 82 fig. 15) = *LIMC* Astra 16 / Demeter 458 / Eos 14 / Hekate 26 / Helios 121. Prückner (1968, 82–83) reviews other notions of the scene that seem much less probable.

52. The plaque is fragmentary, being assembled from several pieces. The seated woman's upper body is missing, and it is only by conjecture that she is made to look dejected.

53. Cf. Prückner (1968, 83–84).

54. The usual story of Hades abducting Persephone appears on just a few of the Locrian plaques: Prückner (1968, 68–70), types 57–59. Many other scenes show a handsome youth instead: Prückner (1968, 70–74), types 60–83. They are only alluded to, without any detail, by Ruth Lindner, *LIMC* 4.1 (1988, 379) s. Hades, while canvassing some unlikely interpretations.

55. The name is used again when she takes up the drink called *kykeon* (211) and at the very end (492), after mention of the principal cult sites Eleusis, Paros, and Antron. It is always joined with an epithet (in the sixth foot after

(πολυ)πότνια at lines 47 and 211, in the fifth foot after a string of them at line 492)—perhaps it too was intended as an epithet, to be later misunderstood as a name. It is also proposed as a correction, one of several, of the unmetrical Δὼς ἐμοίγ' κτλ at line 122, where Demeter as an old woman gives an assumed name. But there are good reasons why it cannot be *Deo* (she would not give a true name and one so distinctive, nor would it be miscopied) and good reasons for preferring another name (see Richardson ad loc.).

56. The *Hymn to Demeter* has inspired all later occurrences of Δῆς = Demeter, as in tragedy. This in turn inspires the decorative epithets Δηῶινη, Δηῶϊς, Δηῶιη for Demeter's daughter Persephone, and Δηῶϊος for Demeter's victim Triopas. The spelling and indeed the phrase πότνια Δηῶ appear on stone in a dedication of c. 450 B.C., IG 1³ 953 = CEG 1.317.

57. Both Frisk, *GEW* and Chantraine, *DELG* s. Δημήτηρ are content with a hypocoristic Δηῶ; Richardson on *H. Cer.* 47 is not, and shows reason. (He cites from *Et. Magn.* s. Δῆς the observation that a hypocoristic like Εἰδῶ, Ὑψῶ always keeps the consonant of the second syllable, but nothing can be made of Δημς at *H. Cer.* 107, since this was so common as a personal name that it could never be a divine one.) Richardson prefers a "by-form" of the element Δη- in Demeter's name; Schwyzer, *Gr. Gram.* 1.636 (but otherwise 1.478) fixes on the strange word Δᾱ. Both Δη- and Δ are entirely hypothetical, and there is still no proper analogy for

Δηῶ. Δημήτηρ may well be a syncopated form of δημο-μήτηρ "Mother of the community," differentiated thus from the more ancient δρεία Μήτηρ. A like goddess is called Δαμία at Aegina, Epidaurus, and Troezen (Hdt. 5.82–83, Paus. 2.30.4, 32.2), Δαμσοα at Sparta (IG 5.1 nos. 363, 1217, 1314), and Tarentum has a festival Δαμσα (Hsch. s. ν.). Δημώνασσα is a like name for a goddess of metal working: Robertson (1978a).

58. The papyrus is thus dated by Kouremenos, Parassoglou, and Tsantsanoglou (2006, 8–9).

59. Moraux (1959, 30–38) gives the fullest account of evidence and opinion about *Daeira*.

60. Tzetz. *Lycophr. Alex.* 710; cf. Holzinger ad loc.

61. These feminine endings often appear "without any clear *Grundwort*" (Schwyzer, *Gr. Gram.* 1.474). It is impossible to tell whether Δάειρα or Δαῖρα came first, or whether they were concurrent from the outset, since both occur in both documents and literature.

62. = Lambert (2002b, 45, 59–60); the day of the month is probably lost in the lacuna at the end of line 11 and is possibly the twelfth or the twenty-first. As Lambert also remarks, the site may be a local *Eleusinion* as at Paeania.

63. = SIG³ 1029 line 39. As to the month see Rosivach (1994, 52III08).

64. At Eleusis the *Chloaia* follow the *Haloia* of *Posideon* = December. Deubner (1932, 67) canvasses a later date for the *Chloaia*, *Anthesteriôn* or even *Thargeliôn*. *Thargeliôn* does not suit the first sprouting or leave room for the *Antheia* (then unknown). The calendar of Myconos prescribes two sows, one gravid, for Demeter *chloe* on 12 *Posideôn* (SIG³ 1024 = *LSCG* 96 lines 11–15), which is close enough. But Demeter *chloe*, we should observe, was not restricted to the like-named festival, for she receives offerings at quite other times.

65. M. H. Jameson as editor of IG i³ 250 does not distinguish the calendar and the list, which is a deme decree, in the same way that Nilsson did (1944, 70–72),

and W. Peek before him. He reverses the order of the two columns on the stone. Whereas Peek and Nilsson regard the deme decree as occupying a column and a half, their A and B, followed by a brief calendar, Jameson regards the deme decree as occupying half a column, his A, followed by a lengthy calendar. Yet the column at issue deals with duties and perquisites, as does the undoubted deme decree, not with offerings as does the undoubted calendar. Though Jameson has improved the text, he evidently worked in haste. The notable improvement at A 6–7, eliminating the festival *Hephaistia*, avowedly came too late to be adopted in the text—so he says in the apparatus, and he also fails to notice it in the commentary. I distinguish just as Peek and Nilsson did, while citing perforce the arrangement of the text in IG.

66. By contrast, “Hecate” is a name or epithet of Artemis in the comprehensive calendars of Erchia and Thoricus. It is on 16 *Metageitniōn* = August “in [the precinct] of Hecate” that Erchia honors *Kurotrophos* and “Artemis Hecate” (Daux 1963 = SEG 21.541, B 1–13). The date points to Artemis’ summer festival, to a counterpart of the *Braurōnia*, and the name is presumably conferred for the same reason as at Brauron ([Hes.] fr. 23a, 26, 23b). It is sometime in *Hekatombaïōn* = July, just after another sacrifice at the local *Delphinion*, that Thoricus honors “Hecate” (Daux 1983 = SEG 33.147 = IG i³ 256 bis, lines 6–8). The date and the context both point to an Apolline festival associating Apollo and Artemis.

67. According to Clinton (1974, 98), the *kurotrophos* was not “a sacred official” at Eleusis, and so the *daeirites* may not have been either. On the contrary, all the officiants here named plainly belong to Eleusis.

68. Eustath. *Il.* 6.378. She is equated too with Hera as “sister-in-law” of Demeter (**δάρεια < δαήρ*, *ibid.*), and we are further told by Servius on Aen. 4.58 that “when Demeter is honored at Eleusis Hera’s shrine is closed” and vice versa, “and Hera’s priestess is not allowed to taste what is offered to Demeter.” Nilsson (1935, 82–83) favors the meaning “sister-in-law” as another of “the common nouns characteristic of Eleusinian cult,” such as “the pair of gods,” “the god,” “the goddess.” But these other titles are aust, and “sister-in-law” is not.

69. Sister of Styx: Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 45. Wife of Hades dwelling beside Styx: Lycophr. *Alex.* 706–10. These and the warder are all cited by Eustathius.

70. Aesch. *Psychagogoi* fr. 277 Radt, cited by Eustathius. He also cites Phanodemus *FGrH* 325 F 15 for equating her, curiously, with both Aphrodite and Demeter. The language is emphatic, and despite Jacoby “the suspicion of a corruption” does not arise.

71. Clem. *Protr.* 3.45.1. For the seasonal implication see Robertson (1996c, 55). Yet again, she is an Oceanid, i.e. a virtual spring or stream, mother by Hermes of the eponymous hero Eleusis (Paus. 1.38.7).

72. So Aelius Dionysius *apud* Eustathius, perhaps the proximate source throughout.

73. Halfway through his discussion the commentator says “it is stated in the

Hymns as well (*ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς Ὑμνοῖς εἰρημένον*) : *Demeter Rhea Ge Meter Hestia Deio*” (XXII 11–12). The six names have always been taken as a quotation, a halting hexameter line compact with nominative or vocative forms. *Orph.* fr. 398 Bernabe, entitled “A Hymn to Demeter,” presents the papyrus text with a metrical supplement suggested by Obbink (1994, 122–24). Even so this is not a credible verse, much less a memorable one, a declaration of a great truth. And if it were a quotation, the commentator would say either “in a *Hymn*” or “in the *Hymn* to X.” Instead, he gives us a list of titles, of goddesses to whom Orpheus’ *Hymns* are separately addressed. It is of interest that the existing collection of eighty-seven Orphic *Hymns*, admittedly late and very lightly garnished with Orphic doctrine,

includes all of them—not only *Demeter*, *Ge*, and *Hestia* as we might expect, but also *Rhea* and *Meter* as different entities, and Hecate in first place, standing in for *Deio*.

74. So West (1983, 81–82, 93–94), Obbink (1994, 123n40; 1997, 49III5), Parker (1996, 496), Bernabe on *Orph.* fr. 18 (but Bernabe 2002, 122–23 is agnostic). According to Janko (2001, 31III83), Zeus begot Demeter on Rhea before begetting Persephone on Demeter, a notion unsupported by evidence or argument and entailing even more generations than the later Orphic theogonies.

75. There is no hint of it in col. XXII. Nor does *Demeter* = *Rhea* appear in the list of equations in Philodemus' *On Piety*, which his learned source drew from both poets at large and, according to Obbink (1994), from Orpheus *apud* the Attic chroniclers.

76. West (1983, 94) is definite, asserting that the text was left incomplete at the end of this roll and “continued in another roll, or several.” Others leave the question open, more or less: so Bernabe (2002, 123–24) and on *Orph.* fr. 18, and Kouremenos, Parassoglou, and Tsantsanoglou (2006, 7). Parker (1995a, 496) says only, “chance draws a veil over the sequel, the papyrus ending there.”

77. Pfeiffer *ad loc.* thinks it probable that Callimachus drew on an Orphic source, and also that Apollodorus of Athens transmitted his report to the scholiast.

78. For Musaeus Hecate is daughter of Zeus and Asteria, the Titan mother in Hesiod (schol. *Apoll. loc. cit.* = *Vorsokr* 2 B 16). This could be taken as a tribute to Hesiod and Orpheus jointly.

79. See further F. Wüst, *RE Suppl.* 8 (1956) 85 s. Erinyes.

80. The Suda credits Euphion with a work *Mopsopia* said to be on Attica, to which this fragment is sometimes assigned, as by Powell on *Coll. Alex.* fr. 34.

81. See K. Ziegler, *ML* 5 (1916–1924) 1523 s. Theogonien; West (1983, 125–26).

82. Linguists conjecture that the root of *στυγέω*, *Στύξ* means “cold”: Frisk, *GEW* and Chantraine, *dElGs.v*.

83. In Hesiod Styx does not actually marry Zeus but with her children takes his side against the Titans (*Theog.* 389–401).

Zeus *Milichios* in Spring

Synopsis

Column A, line 9:

And to Zeus *milichios* in [the land] of Myskos [sacrifice] a full-grown animal.

The same clause that prescribes sacrifice to Zeus *eumenês* and the *Eumenides* prescribes another to Zeus *milichios*. The former sacrifice, as we saw, belongs to a festival of early spring, directly attested at neighboring Entella but best known from Athens' cult of the *Semnai Theai*. The sacrifice to Zeus *milichios* belongs to another festival of early spring. It is more widely attested, but again we must go to Athens for instructive detail. These two festival occasions make it unnecessary for the tablet to say anything about the sacrificial mode, in contrast to all the other ritual it prescribes.

The festival of Zeus *milichios* takes place "in [the land] of Myskos," whereas a shrine of Zeus *milichios* visited at a later time is to be found "in [the land] of Euthydamos." At Athens too the festival takes place "in [the land] of Agra," and a shrine of Zeus *milichios* visited at a later time is to be found on the opposite side of the city. At Selinus Myskos is "Pollution" personified, for such is the imagined threat of the Lenten season. At Athens Agra "Chase" refers rather to the seasonal activity of the hunt. The extensive district so called is known for five festivals of early spring, addressed respectively to Demêtêr or rather Persephone, to Zeus *milichios*, to Artemis, to the Mother, and to Poseidon. We shall see in due course that Athens has two coordinate areas, Agra at the southeast and a hilly area at the northwest, in which rites are successively performed during the same period as column A of the tablet.

The Two Locations

Here, at the outset, “Zeus *milichios*” is located “in [?] of *Myskos*,” but “*milichios*” below is located “in [?] of *Euthydamos*” (lines 17–18). The title “*milichios*” by itself is fully interchangeable with “Zeus *milichios*.”

The elliptic phrases ἐν Μοσ and ἐν Εὐθυδάμο indicate contrasting locations. In the translation and textual notes I anticipate the argument by rendering “in [the land] of” *Myskos* and again “in [the land] of” *Euthydamos*. What sort of locations are they?

The phrases seem to be routine; they seem to be the Greek idiom, similar to English, which after ἐν and also εἰς and ἐξ drops words like “house,” “shrine,” “land”—some concrete, localized thing—belonging to a person, a god, or a group:

ἐν ἀφνειοῦ πατρός, ἐν Αἶδαο, ἐμ Μολπῶν, ἐν Κεραμείων, and the like.¹ At first glance, it is natural to take *Myskos* and *Euthydamos* as persons, all the more since one *Myskos* appears on an early gravestone at Selinus. The trouble is that such persons do not provide any conceivable setting for the worship of Zeus *milichios*.

JJK suggest the rendering “in the plot of *Myskos*,” “in the plot of *Euthydamos*.”² They think of *Myskos* and *Euthydamos* as leading figures at Selinus, historical persons of great importance who became the ancestors of two “gentilitial groups.” Such groups, they also think, had their own proprietary shrines of Zeus *milichios*. People at large are now directed to make use of the shrines belonging to these two groups, perhaps because just these had been involved in recent violence requiring purification. As a variation urged by others, it is said that the two men are themselves worshipped as tutelary heroes, and (Zeus) *milichios* is perhaps a stele standing in each shrine.³ The view expressed by JJK has been followed more often.⁴

Now Zeus *milichios* is well known at Selinus for his precinct on the *Gaggera* hill west of the city, west of the river Selinus.⁵ And it is true that from perhaps the mid-sixth century a few of the many *milichios* stones that stood in the precinct were inscribed as belonging to an individual or to several individuals or in one case to “the *Kleulidas*” and in another to the “*patria*” of two families of daughters. No doubt the persons in question, and even the families or clans, worshipped at their own *milichios* stones. Yet these sites separately marked within the precinct are not the same as a shrine belonging to a professed descent group.⁶ Many gods and heroes in many Greek cities have such shrines. Not Zeus *milichios*, however. The only recorded instance is far away and of a special kind.⁷ Athens’ *Phythalidai* have charge of a famous public altar of Zeus *milichios* on the road west of the city, at the Cephissus crossing—but the numerous Attic *gene* who have charge of famous public cults are a phenomenon that is not to be assumed forthwith for other cities.⁸

Furthermore, *Myskos* and *Euthydamos* as individual names cannot

stand for descent groups, who would be denoted by a patronymic form or phrase: ^{ἐν}

**Μυσχιδᾶν* οἱ ἐν τῶν ἀπὸ *Μύσσο*, ἐν **Εὐθυδαμιδᾶν* οἱ ἐν τῶν ἀπὸ *Εὐθυδάμο*.⁹ If an individual has his own plot as a place of worship, he can only be a hero, the alternative suggestion. But sacrifice to Zeus *milichios* would not take place at a hero shrine.¹⁰

More recently, it has been pointed out that *myskos* and *euthydemos* are both glossed in the lexica.¹¹ Hesychius: *μύσκος*: *μίασμα*, *κῆδος*. Hesychius, Photius: *εὐθύδημον*: *ἀπλοῦν δημότην*. *Εὐριπίδης Ἀντιόπη* (fr. 227 Kannicht / 278 Mette). In this use they are not personal names but states or conditions. The first is “pollution, anxiety / grief.”¹² The second is “ordinary member of the *demos*”: anyone, we may suppose, who belongs to the community, any citizen. Euripides’ *Antiope* spoke famously of citizenship and its rights and duties. The twins Amphon and Zethus, born and reared in the wild without knowledge of their origin, are revealed as the royal heirs at Thebes, rather like Theseus at Athens. They are also opposites, contemplative and practical, and which makes a better citizen is debated.

The two states or conditions, “pollution” and “ordinary member of the *demos*,” are somehow contrasting. At Selinus they are mentioned at different times, in the chronological order we have discerned in column A. “Pollution” belongs to early spring, “ordinary member of the *demos*” to early summer. Both states or conditions seem to occur elsewhere as seasonal concerns. In early spring, pollution is an imagined threat to the new crop, which has yet to ripen. In early summer the new crop is gathered in, and everyone, every “ordinary member of the *demos*,” joins in giving thanks. Zeus *milichios* has to do with both concerns—with pollution, as in the stories to be mentioned in this chapter and the next, and with a general thanksgiving after the harvest (see [chapter 13](#)).

The Name *Myskos*

Both are personified, as *Myskos* and as *Euthydamos*; both names are borne by ordinary persons. But whereas “ordinary member of the *demos*” seems quite suitable as a personal name, “pollution” does not. Yet “Mr. Pollution” is not uncommon in its various forms: *Μύσσο*s (Selinus, that early gravestone), *Μύσκων* (Camirus, Gela?, Camarina, Syracuse), *Μύσχων* (Athens), *Μύσκελος* (Rhypes in Achaea, Crannon, Halicarnassus, Catane?), *Μύσκελλος* (a variant form for the person of Rhypes), *Μύσσκελος* (Gela?). *Μύσσελος* (Herbessus), *Μύσκαλλος* (Apollonia in Illyria), *Μυσχίδης* (Athens?).¹³ This is a most unsavory word, an expressive, guttural *μύσος*.¹⁴ It would be very puzzling as a personal name—were it not familiar as either a ritual term or a city

district. *Μύσος*, we shall soon see, is the name of a city district known for the ritual there conducted. An inscription said to be from Gela, not so far from Selinus, gives us the family line *Μύσκον Δάμιος τοῦ Κοβέτου* (IGDS 134 = *Iscr. Sic.* 1.77, 2.80 = SEG 45.1359). *Kobetos* is evidently a Sicel name, and *Damis* is a short form, as for *Euthydamos*. In the second and third generations this immigrant family, or local family with external interests, appears to use our district names, (*Euthy*)*damos* and *Myskos*.

Besides *Μύσος*, *Μύσος* itself serves as a name (Chios?, Sicily, even Selinus?, Cyrene, Naucratis), and also *Μύσων* (Thespieae, Cheneae?).¹⁵ The former is wrongly taken as *Μυσός* “Mysian”; they are otherwise unremarked. Now the name *Μύσος* twice appears in early dedications, to Aphrodite at Naucratis and to Apollo at some place not definitely known.¹⁶ The dedication to Apollo is revealing: *Μύσος τῷ <ι> { : } Ἀπόλλωνι ἀντὶ μιᾶς δύο* “Mr. Pollution (offers) to Apollo two outpourings instead of one” (understanding a noun such as *λοιβή*).¹⁷ These words are incised on the bottom of a kind of cup, a cup with pellets in its hollow foot, which was used to pour libation as the pellets rattled portentously.¹⁸ Apollo has much to do with pollution and any magic means of removing it—with scapegoats, for example. “Two instead of one” is a magic means of removing pollution, as in the celebrated case of the two bronze statues serving to replace the mistreated body of the Spartan regent Pausanias, *δύο σώματα ἀνθ’ ενός* “two bodies instead of one.”¹⁹ The provenance of the cup (in a private collection) is unrecorded. It is dated by style and lettering to the early fifth century, and the lettering, says Jeffery, may point to Sicily, and even to Selinus in particular. “Mr. Pollution” here, being so perfect for the role, is probably a fiction rather than a real person. He illustrates the importance of *μύσος* or *μύσκος* as a ritual term.²⁰ But so do all these names, as borne by real persons.

Μύσκελος or *Μύσκελλος* of Rhypes in Achaea, founder of Croton, was doubtless a real person, like other founders, but like them he was caught up in a web of fiction. Some of it was suggested by the mere name.²¹ He was a hunchback, addressed as such by the Delphic oracle; his father was *Ἀλήμων* “Wanderer,” a bogus name like *Ἀλήτης* of Corinth and again of Mycenae; when brought to trial for attempting to leave his native city, he was *squalidus* “dirty looking.”²² The trial, on which his life depends, points to a ritual background. He stood condemned when black pebbles filled the voting urn, but was acquitted when they miraculously changed to white (Ov. *Met.* 15.2848). *Myskelos* is like Orestes in being put to this ordeal. Orestes’ ordeal was suggested by the cult of the *Eumenides* (ch. 6), and has much to do with black and white. Black and white sheep may have been offered in succession.²³

Now it can be shown that the phrase *ἐν Μύσσο* refers to a district rather than a shrine or other precinct: the omitted word will be *χόροι* (i.e. *χώρῳ*) “land.” There is a striking parallel at Athens, which itself has almost passed without remark: “in the land of Agra.” Pollution is countered by ritual in the land of Agra—at the spring festival of Zeus *milichios*, here called *Diasia*. This neglected evidence at Athens matches the new evidence at Selinus.

“In [the Land] of Agra”

Athenian usage, always the best known, has one exception to the normal scope of the idiom, *in [something] of someone*. The phrase *ἐν Ἀγρᾷ* should mean *ἐν [χώρῳ] Ἀγρᾷ* in [the land] of the Chase,” being applied to the district beyond the Ilissus river and the earliest settlement of Athens. Moreover, the “chase” is an activity characteristic of spring just as “pollution” is a characteristic condition. As days lengthen and the weather warms, hunters go out at dawn to take the animals that are newly active.

The uniqueness of this phrase *ἐν Ἀγρᾷ* has not been appreciated.²⁴ Given *ἐν Κήποις* “in the Gardens” and *ἐν Λίμναις* “in the Marshes,” both nearby at Athens, why not *ἐν Ἀγραι*? Because “Chase,” unlike “Gardens” and “Marshes,” is not an obvious way to describe a certain area. A fuller phrase is needed, “in the land of the Chase.” Now the Athenian district has several notable sanctuaries, and the Athenian phrase, like ours at Selinus, is used to locate them; it is hardly used otherwise. The largest by far, the setting of “the greatest festival of Zeus” in the story of Cylon, is that of Zeus *milichios*. The other sanctuaries belong to Demêter, Artemis *agrotera*, the Mother, and Poseidon *helikonios*.²⁵

Being so peculiar, the authentic phrase *ἐν Ἀγρᾷ* is preserved only by inscriptions and by one special case in the literary tradition; it is implied in another. For Zeus *milichios* it first came to light in the Erchia calendar, apropos of his festival *Diasia* in *Anthesterion* (SEG 21.541).²⁶ A calendar found on the Acropolis, datable to 480–460 B.c., uses it twice in a row—it must be so restored—for Zeus *milichios* and for the Mother (IG I³ 234).²⁷ It is also used of the Mother’s shrine in financial records of 429/8 and 423/2 b.c. (IG I³ 383 and 369).²⁸ As a rule, later inscriptions and literary sources treat Agra or Agrai as the name outright and the object of any preposition: *πρὸς Ἀγρᾶν*, *πρὸς Ἀγρας*, *ἐν Ἀγραις*. But *ἐν Ἀγρᾷ* survives, amid later deformations and outright corruptions, in ancient lexicons s. *Ἀγρᾶ* or *Ἀγραι*, entries perhaps deriving from Pausanias the Atticist, and quoting Pherecrates, Plato, and Cleidemus, and assigning several shrines to the district.²⁹ At *Phaedrus* 229c Plato respects, and his

manuscripts preserve, though some editors do not, the old usage. The Ilissus ford leads *πρὸς τὸ τῆς Ἀγρας* “to the [land] of *Agra*.”³⁰ Plato understands *χωρίον*, a word used repeatedly of the district (so Paus. 1.19.6 and several lexica). The original word in the original phrase was doubtless *χώρῳ*.

The location and extent of *Agra*, of “the land of the Chase,” have never been properly determined. The district was reached by the Ilissus ford at the fountain Callirrhoe (Pl. *Phaedr.* 229c; cf. Paus. 1.19.5). The ford was needed for rites of spring and thus owed its renown to *Agra*; at any other time the Ilissus bed could easily be crossed at various points. For most of the shrines there is no closer indication than “beside the Ilissus.” Nor do we hear of any temple—the temple foundation southeast of the ford, the Stuart and Revett temple, though sometimes assigned either to the Mother or to Artemis, was undoubtedly the Palladium shrine of Athena.³¹ In default of clear evidence on the ground, the usual view has been that *Agra* extended east from the ford to the stadium of Herodes Atticus and thus consisted of the intervening hills along the Ilissus bank.³² This does not provide a likely setting for the great concourse of worshippers at the Lesser Mysteries and the *Diasia*. Furthermore, the evidence has been misread.

Pausanias might be expected to help. He notices the “place called *Agrai*” and Artemis *agrotera* and then Herodes’ stadium almost in one breath (1.19.6). But a moment before he lumped together the two gymnasia *Kynosarges* and *Lykeion* (1.19.3–4), which as we well know lay on different sides of *Agra*, to the southwest and the northeast respectively. This is not a tour but a checklist; so *Agra* and the stadium need not be close to each other. Cleidemus, quoted for mention of *Agra* and its shrines in different parts of his chronicle (*Anecd. Bekker* 1.326 = *FGrH* 323 F 1, 9, cf. 25), is taken to say, as emended, that *Agra* was a hill or ridge with the shrine of Poseidon *helikonios* on top:

τωι

δ’ ὄχθῳι πάλαι ὄνομα τοῦτο δ’ (ms: τοῦτωι ὡς Bekker) νῦν Ἀγρα καλεῖται Ἑλικῶν. καὶ ἡ ἐσχάρα τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος τοῦ ἐλικωνίου ἐπ’ ἄκρου. If ὄχθος means the range of hills between the ford and the stadium, we must look for Poseidon at the highest point, just west of the stadium. This however is squarely occupied by Herodes’ temple of Tyche.³³ If τοῦτο δ’ is emended rather to ταύτῃ ἢι, we obtain a better sense and word order. “The hill here, where now is so-called *Agra*, once had the name *Helikon*.” The hill in question belongs to a larger district that is not itself a hill. It will be a small single hill rising from the level ground somewhere west of the ford.³⁴

Another piece of evidence has not been pressed as it should be. The “*Kronion* precinct,” i.e. the site of the summer festival *Kronia*, is

said to adjoin the *Olympion* and extend “as far as the *Metroion* in *Agra*” (*Anecd. Bekker* 1.273).³⁵ The *Olympion* boundary agrees with Pausanias’ notice of “a temple of *Kronos* and *Rhea*” near the great temple of *Zeus olympios* (1.18.7).³⁶ It is likely then that the other boundary is correctly given—that the *Metroion* lay due south of the *Olympion* on the other bank of the *Ilissus*, a little to the west of the ford. The spring and summer festivals of the Mother, the *Galaxia* and the *Kronia*, were celebrated at adjacent sites on either side of the stream (they were celebrated on opposite sides of the hill *Kronion* at *Olympia*). Both *Cleidemus* and *Philochorus* as Attic chroniclers appear to have treated the *Kronion* precinct and the *Metroion* together, in the light of the festival legends. The lexicon just quoted very likely drew its notice of the precinct from *Cleidemus’* Book Four, where the *Metroion* in *Agra* was mentioned (*FGrH* 323 F 9). *Cleidemus* also explained, doubtless in the same place, that the Mother was *Rhea* (F 25).³⁷ *Philochorus* told how *Kronos* and *Rhea*—“*Saturn* and *Ops*” in *Macrobius’* report—were first honored by *Cecrops*, and in place of *Zeus* and *Ge* (*FGrH* 328 F 97). This last detail looks to the *Olympion* and the neighboring shrine of *Ge*.

We seem to be directed, for both *Poseidon helikonios* and the Mother, to the area west of the ford, where the ground is mostly low and level. At a minimum, no definite evidence points to the hills farther east. A large tract of level ground was required for the festival crowd at both the Lesser Mysteries and the *Diasia*. Even in the early fifth century the Lesser Mysteries were accorded a Panhellenic truce of the same duration as the Greater Mysteries (*IG* 1³ 6 B 36-47; cf. chapter 4, pp. 65-66). *Thucydides*, having said that “the greatest festival of *Zeus*” was appointed by the Delphic oracle as the moment for *Cylon’s* coup, explains that the *Diasia* are “a festival of *Zeus milichios* of the greatest... at which a multitude offer sacrifice *en masse*” (1.126.4, 6).³⁸

This civic festival is the only one to be recognized in the deme calendars of *Erchia* and *Thoricus*, with a victim that was obviously shared by the demesmen.³⁹ Every family that could afford it offered a victim and dined on meat; the many poor dined on a meat substitute, cakes shaped like animals.⁴⁰ A customary dish was a blood pudding roasted over an open fire (*Ar. Nub.* 408-11). The festival site was therefore a picnic ground with as many hearths as sufficed for all the cooking. Families must have gathered by deme, to share such victims as *Erchia* and *Thoricus* provided. The demes number upward of 133. Even if smaller demes shared a hearth, a hundred or so would still be needed, and plenty of room round each of them.

It is evident that *Agra* was, or included, a very large area of level open ground. On the south bank of the *Ilissus* this is only to be found

west of the ford. Next to it, on the north bank of the Ilissus, is another ancient district, the one identified by Thucydides as the earliest settlement below the Acropolis (2.15.3-6). Thucydides has not escaped objection from modern critics, but he is right and they are wrong.⁴¹ Here, he says, are Athens' earliest public shrines—he mentions four, one with a festival recurring throughout Ionia, and he knows of others, which we can nowadays supply. We can also add the observation that no other part of the lower city has any concentration of early shrines. The small district beside the Ilissus is indeed the earliest center of Athens city.

Agra, lying next to it beyond the Ilissus, reaches back just as far. It is an area exclusively of shrines, of somber powers of nature, chief among them Zeus *milichios*, and their rites all belong to spring and are all concerned with a fear of pollution. It was the custom for the community to go across the Ilissus every spring to worship in a district set apart.

Festivals of *Agra*

The deities of *Agra* are honored in close succession during early to mid-spring, in the months *Anthesterion* = February, *Elaphebolion* = March, *Munichion* = April. In calendar order the deities are Demêtêr of the *Lesser Mysteries*, Zeus *milichios*, Artemis *agrotera*, the Mother, and Poseidon *helikonios*. For all but Artemis *agrotera* the dates are apparent at once.

The festival *Diasia* for Zeus *milichios* comes round on 23 *Anthesterion*, and the Mother's festival *Galaxia* sometime in *Elaphebolion*, so that the successive offerings in the above-mentioned calendar pertain to these two festivals (IG 1³ 234).⁴² Poseidon's recurring epithet *helikonios* and his recurring cult site *Helikon* are propitiously named for the deep waters, called ἑλίκ "black," which he supplies in spring, in the month of April, often named *Taureon* after his festival *Taurea*.⁴³ Demêtêr's shrine was the setting for the *Lesser Mysteries* of *Anthesterion*, probably 15-17 *Anthesterion* (chapter 4, p. 65). This festival, let us note in passing, would better suit *Korê* / Persephone than Demêtêr. Though Demêtêr has a series of festivals marking stages in the farmer's labors and the growth of his crop, a celebration in early spring is not otherwise to the fore. *Korê* / Persephone is separately worshipped at this time, and in fact the *Lesser Mysteries* are said to address the story of Dionysus, presumably the story that he was son of Persephone.⁴⁴ The *Mysteries* of Eleusis as Athens' proudest worship imposed a corresponding interpretation on what was in origin a festival of a different kind, and the interpretation includes the very name Demêtêr.

Artemis *agrotera* needs a closer look. As a rule, it is not springtime when our fancy turns to her. Both in literature and in ephebic inscriptions she is known for the great procession of 6 *Boêdromiôn* = September, when five hundred goats were led to her shrine as a thank-offering for Marathon. And the offering is only an extension of her age-old worship as partner to Apollo in the festival *Boedromia* of 6–7 *Boêdromiôn*.⁴⁵ The Polemarch conducted this warlike festival at different shrines on successive days, first at the shrine of Artemis in *Agra* and then at the *Lykeion*, Apollo's shrine, which gave its name to the Polemarch's official quarters, *ἐν Λυκείῳ, ἐπὶ Λυκείου*.⁴⁶ The festival belongs to Apollo quite as much as to Artemis, or rather more so since the epithet *boedromios* is elsewhere distinctive of Apollo.

But at Athens Artemis *agrotera* came to predominate in the festival, and at an early date, long before Marathon. The story of the Amazon invasion and the ensuing battle with Theseus is an *aition* of the *Boedromia*, described as such by Plutarch and excerpted at length from the Attic chroniclers.⁴⁷ Theseus, commanding on the right wing of the Athenian army as a virtual Polemarch, and therefore at or near the *Lykeion* in the battle line described by Cleidemus, offers sacrifice before battle. Not to Apollo, however, but to *Phobos* "Battle-rout." In [Aristotle]'s summary account of the Polemarch's ritual duties, the festival deities are Artemis *agrotera* and *Enyalios* "War-whoop" (*Ath.* 58.1)—an expressive name, preserving its original significance in Xenophon's phrase *Ἐνναλίῳ ἐλελίζειν* (*Anab.* 1.8.18, etc.). Apollo was replaced by *Phobos* or *Enyalios*, personifications of the warlike ritual. At Athens he gave up his role as war god to appear instead as the glorious patron of song and dance at the *Thargelia*; so he did among Ionians generally and became very different from the Dorian Apollo.⁴⁸ Artemis *agrotera* emerged as the sole presiding deity of the *Boedromia*, and she alone received the thank-offering for Marathon.⁴⁹

Artemis *agrotera* once had a festival of her own, without Apollo. Artemis is typically worshipped in spring, and spring months are named for her festivals. At Athens the months *Elaphebolion* and *Munichion* are so named. *Elaphebolia* "deer-slaying [rites]" are a festival of the chase, a former way of life extolled by the myths of Artemis and by her very image. The festival has left no mark in Ionian calendars of the islands and the opposite coast.⁵⁰ It is matched rather by the festival *Laphria* among West Greek speakers in the homeland; this and similar festival names give the month names *Elaphios* (Elis), *Laphriaia* (Aetolia), *Lophriaia* (Cruni in West Locris), *Laphrios* (Erineus, Gythium), and *Elaphrios* (Cnidus).⁵¹ The day was probably the sixth of the month, the usual choice for festivals of Artemis. Since Apollo's warlike festival follows at a six-month interval and his shrine is not far away, Artemis *agrotera* was recruited for a second

appearance then. But her title comes from the festival of the chase, and she confers the name “Chase” on the district where other festivals are conducted at the same season.

The festivals in question, to resume, are the *Lesser Mysteries* of ? 15-17 *Anthesterion*, the *Diasia* of 23 *Anthesterion*, the *Elaphebolia* of ?6 *Elaphebolion*, the *Galaxia* of ?mid-*Elaphēbolicōn*, and Poseidon’s festival of *Munichion*. After the *Diasia*, on 25 or 26 *Anthesterion*, the *Semnai Theai* were propitiated on the Acropolis (see chapter 7). During perhaps two full months, from perhaps mid- February to mid-April, *Agra* was frequented by Athenians engaged in nearly all the season’s ritual. Within this span the only festivals of note not conducted at *Agra* are later innovations: the civic *Dionysia* of mid-*Elaphebolion*, and the *Asklepieia* a day or two earlier. Conversely, no festival we know of was conducted at *Agra* at any other time of year except, in part, the *Boedromia*. This district beyond the Ilissus was marked off in Athens’ early days for rites of spring.

The district is named propitiously for an age-old activity of spring, *agra* “the chase,” promoted by Artemis and signalized by her deer-slaying rites. But it is the festival *Diasia* of Zeus *milichios* that requires the largest tract of ground and draws the largest attendance by far. In its greatest days it drew households from the whole of Attica. It aims to dispel the fear of pollution that comes with the Lenten season of diminished resources. The district might just as well have been named *Myskos*. To understand this fear of pollution we turn in the next chapter to a different range of evidence, extending throughout Greece.

1. The general idiom is illustrated by Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 2.120. Many instances with ἐν in Attic inscriptions are cited by Threatte, *Gram. of Att. Inscr.* 2.383–85. A few of these refer to gods, e.g. ἐν Διονύσου, a few to gene or other associations, e.g. ἐμ Φιλομηλιδῶν, but most refer to demes, e.g. ἐν Κεραμῶν. Here the usual assumption, shared by Schwyzler and Threatte, is that δήμωι is omitted. The idiom however requires a concrete noun such as χώρῳ: “in / at Potters’ [land],” not “in / at Potters’ [people / community].”

2. JJK 15, 52–53, 93, 97, 102, 121 (in the last place it is “lots”). The Greek might be ἐν [τοῖ τεμένει].

3. Dubois (1995a, 558; 1995b, 134). “The syntagma ἐν + genitive of an anthroponym,” he says, usually denotes a sanctuary, for which use he cites, rather oddly, “the celebrated ἐν Αἰδου as well as “the Laconian ΓαῖαΦόχο 5.1.213” (the same inscription also has ἐν Ἀριοντίας). The Greek then might be either ἐν [τοῖ τεμένει] or ἐν [τοῖς ἱερῶι]. Clinton (1996, 165) speaks of “Selinuntine local heroes” with “a precinct of Zeus Melichios in or attached to their sanctuaries” (my emphasis). Curti and van Bremen (1999, 28, 31) look for two hero shrines on Gaggera and in the agora respectively—while making the

fundamental observation that the words *myskos* and *euthydamos* are used in quite a different way.

4. B. Jordan (1996, 327), Cordano (1996, 138–39; 1997, 425–26), Manganaro (1997, 563–64), Lazzarini (1998, 314–17), Rausch (2000a, 41–44, 49), Ekroth (2002, 219, 321n49). Lupu (2005, 367) leaves the question open.

5. JJK 89–91 (inscriptions), 103–107, 133–136. Here as elsewhere the spelling of the title varies: *μιλίχιος, μελίχιος, μηλίχιος, μειλίχιος*. I shall render it everywhere without distinction as *milichios*, even though literary texts have perhaps accustomed us to *meilichios*.

6. “These places,” scil. of *Myskos* and *Euthydamos*, “we take to be a defined space or plot, probably containing one of the characteristic... stones that have been found in the area... referred to as the *Campo di Stele*,” say JJK 52. I think they mean that the shrines of *Myskos* and *Euthydamos* lay elsewhere. Or do they mean that the shrines are within the *Campo di Stele*! They are so understood by Curti and van Bremen (1999, 28–29).

7. JJK 92 cite four supposed parallels, the altar of the *Phytalidai* and three others: (1) IG 2² 4677—a cylindrical column, third century B.C., dedicated by one *Zōpyriōn*, found on the north side of the Hill of the Nymphs—is conjecturally assigned to “another *genos* or similar cult group,” though I cannot see why; (2) the cult association of IG 12.3.1316 (Thera), “those round Polyxenus,” is plainly

irrelevant; (3) *Διὸς Μιλичίου Πανφύλο* at Megara seems irrelevant whatever it means: (a) JJK 84 take it as a boundary stone, the usual notion, Curti and van Bremen (1999, 25) as a dedication, in both cases thinking of the Dorian tribe *Pamphyloī*; Jones (1987, 94) suggests rather “of all the tribes,” scil. the Dorian tribes, and JJK’s objection is not decisive; another possible meaning, quite suitable for Zeus *milichios*, is “of every kindred,” with reference to all ties of blood; (d)

Πάνφυλος is also a personal name (*LGPN* IIIB s.v. Larisa), and *milichios* stones belonging to individuals named in the genitive form the largest category. Most likely is (c), as a collective version of individual *milichios* stones. Zuntz (1971, 102n8) seems to be alone, surprisingly, in comparing this “boundary stone” with the *milichios* stones at Selinus.

8. Hanell (1934, 178) rightly deprecates any comparison between Selinus’ *Kleulidai* and Athens’ *Phytalidai*.

9. No example offers of the ellipse of a word for “shrine” or “precinct” belonging to a group. The omitted word with

ἐν Μολπῶν and ἐν Δημοσιονιδῶν. For the latter, Hedrick (1990, 38) suggests, but does not argue, “sanctuary” / “*ἱερόν.*”

10. Deities are never labeled as the occupants of hero shrines—Aphrodite *ἐν Ἰππολύτου*, taken as such a case by late sources, is in truth located at a place named for “horse unbridling” (properly *Colonus* by the Agora, not the Acropolis south slope). On this point see Robertson (2005, 76–79, 93–97). Dubois (see note 3) identifies “the *milichios*” in this shrine or that as “stelai situated in the shrines”. But it cannot be that sacrifice is directed to a particular object.

11. Curti and van Bremen (1999, 31). The word *μύσκος*, as they remark, is also known to Hdn. Gram. 3.1, p. 148. “We suggest that perhaps behind what may have been names of imaginary, mythistorical ancestors or founders there is a subconscious identification of certain concepts with a physical reality.”

12. For *μίασμα and κῆδος* related meanings are wanted, and for *κῆδος* a fundamental meaning. Curti and van Bremen interpret the definition as “something that belongs to the underworld, the funerary world.” This is

unconvincing. In stories of Zeus *milichios* both pollution and grief are the consequence of violent death, but the violent death is only an aetiological motif.

13. Most of these names are registered in LGPN I, II, IIIA, IIIB (oddly, each place has only one instance). *Μύσκελος* and variants were already assembled by Masson (1989). The native of Rhypes who founds Croton is called *Μύσκελλος* by Delphic oracles, but other accounts give other forms, including *Myscelus* (Ovid, *Met.* 15.20). Dubois on IGDS 71 regards *Μύσρος* and *Μύσκων* as of different origin from *Μύσκελος*, for which various explanations have been offered: see note 21.

14. So Frisk, *GEW* s. *μύσος*, comparing Hsch. *μίαχος· μιάσμα*

15. LGPN I, IIIA, IIIB. LGPNII *Μυσός* (Athens) is in fact the same as LGPNIIIA *Μυσός* (Sicily?), the dedication I discuss. Jeffery in Vickers and Jeffery (1974, 430) gives the two instances at Naucratis. *Μύσων* (of Chenae?) is an apt name for the humblest and obscurest of all the early sages.

16.

Μύσος μ' ἀνέθηκεν [τῇι Ἀφρο]δίτῃ / Ὀνομακρίτο
says a graffito on a shard at Naucratis: Jeffery in Vickers and Jeffery (1974, 430). *Mysos* son of *Onomakritos* is obviously a real person, as *Mysos* on the rattling cup perhaps is not.

17. Jeffery in Jeffery and Vickers (1974, 430–431), while admitting the text above as a possibility, thinks also of *μυσσός*, a misspelling of *μυσσός*, dual of *μυσσός* (“absurd,” Hsch.), and of *Ἀπόμων* “a hypothetical friend” rather than Apollo. Matthaiou (1988) reads *Mús* “ζοτς” “Mys son of Otes,” the latter name otherwise unknown.

18. The use of the cups must be inferred from just one certain instance: Vickers in Vickers and Jeffery (1974, 430). It seems a likely use for ours, with the dedication.

19. Thuc. 1.134.4, Diod. 11.45.8–9, Paus. 3.17.7–9, etc. M. Robertson *apud* Jeffery in Vickers and Jeffery (1974, 431n22) compares Thucydides’ account with the rattling cup. The cup in fact suggests that “two instead of one” is in origin a paradigm of devout munificence, not a specific penalty. In the story of Pausanias this proverbial phrase has been combined with the actual two statues in Athena’s shrine.

20. The personal name *Θαργήλιος* vel. sim. (LGPN I-II, Aegean islands, Athens) would be comparable, if the festival name always evoked the scapegoat custom, as in e.g. Harp. s. *φάρμακος*. But it has many happier associations.

21. According to Ogden (1997, 62–72), the name *Μύσκελος* evokes several ordinary words suggesting deformity or uncleanness—*μῦ, μῦς, μύσκλοι, σκέλος, σκελλός*, and indeed *μύσκος*—so that he is, on any possible outlook, an abhorred creature, a scapegoat. Masson (1989) and Amigues (1989) canvass the same words for an etymology descriptive of his deformity. Either approach seems misguided.

22. Delphic oracle: Hippys *FGrH* 554 F 1, Antiochus *FGrH* 555 F 10, etc. The Delphic oracle in sportive mood mocks personal deformity; cf. Fontenrose (1978, 139–140). *Alemon*, *Alemonides*: Ov. *Met.* 15.19, 26, 48. *Alêtês* is indeed founder of Corinth or father of its founder *Hippotes*, but the ritual background here, as at other Dorian cities of the Peloponnesus, is the festival *Karneia*; “Wanderer” is only personified indigence, as in the story of his receiving a clod of earth; and this will be somehow true of the name at Mycenae, for a son of Aegisthus and rival of Orestes. *Squalidus... reus*: Ov. *Met.* 15.38. He is so described as he prays to Hercules, who had

appointed this unlikely founder. The description is perhaps the same paradox, unless it is a veristic picture of a defendant parading his distress (so Boomer *ad loc.*).

23. At the shrine near Megalopolis the *Eumenides* appeared to Orestes first as black, then as white (Paus. 8.34.3). At Ceryneia they were appeased by the sacrifice of a black sheep (schol. Soph. *Oed. Col.* 42). Epimenides offered sheep both black and white to the *Semnai Theai* (Diog. Laert. 1.110). It may be that Orestes' trial sometimes turned on black and white pebbles. In a version known only from relief scenes of Roman date, the voting urn becomes the focus of anxious scrutiny: Lesky, *RE* 18.1 (1939, 996–997) s. Orestes 1, E. Simon, *LIMC* 1 (1981) s. Aletes 1–4, H. Sarian, *LIMC* 3 (1986) s. Erinys 75–77, and *LIMC* 7 (1994) s. Orestes 62–64.

24. Daux (1963, 624–625) rightly observed that the phrase is unexplained. Chantraine (1956, 3–4; 1966, 3839) seeks to explain it not as an ellipse but as a local genitive. Yet such a genitive is partitive and always accompanies some noun denoting a lesser extent: Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 2, 113–114. Nor is it reasonable to say that a local genitive is used for its own sake after a local preposition. Simms 2003

offers a new interpretation. *Ἄγρα* or *Ἀγραί* was the name of an ancient goddess later subsumed in Artemis *agrotera*, but formerly presiding over the various activities of women represented by cults throughout the district. So the phrase means “in Agra’s [district]”. Such a goddess and a district named after her are impossible to credit. Since the district kept its ancient ways, why was this colorful figure forgotten? And the meaning of the name is still not explained.

25. All these, but not Zeus *milichios*, are mentioned together at *Anecd. Bekker* 1.326 (see note 30). Obviously, Demeter in Agra and the Mother in Agra are not the same, just as Demeter and the Mother are not the same anywhere. I have elaborated elsewhere as clearly as I can: Robertson (1992, 25–30; 1996a, 274–77). But most opinion continues in denial of the Mother.

26. SEG 21.541 = Daux (1963, 606, A 37–43): “in *Anthesterion*, at the *Diasia*, in town *ἐν Ἀγρᾷ*, for Zeus *milichios* a sheep, without wine until the *splanchna*, 12 drachmas.”

27. IG I³ 234 A 3–5:
[- - - Δι] / [Μ]ιλίχιοι : ἐ[ν Ἀγρᾷ]--- νεφ[]/[Ἀ]λια : Μετρί : ἐ[ν Ἀγρᾷ] - - - 4 ἐ[ν Ἀγρᾷ]
Oikonomides, even before the Erchia calendar came to light. 4–5
νεφ[]/[Ἀ]λια, ἐ[ν Ἀγρᾷ] Prott.

28. IG I³ 383.50 (429/428), 369.91 (423/422). IG I³ 386.146 (408/407, accounts of the Eleusinian *epistatai*) is wrongly restored as ἐκ [τὸν ἐν Ἀγρᾷ] α μυστερίον, an impossible form and phrase: lege ἐν Ἀθῆναι α. In this context—in a mostly Eleusinian milieu—it is the natural way to distinguish the Mysteries of Agra. “The *Great Mysteries*” have just been mentioned (line 144), and the expected contrast otherwise would be not “the *Mysteries* in Agra” but “the *Lesser Mysteries*.”

29. = Pherecrates, *Graes* fr. 40 K-A, Pl. *Phaedr.* 229c, Cleidemus *FGrH* 323 F 1, 9. Erbse (1950, 153–54) restores this and parallel entries as Paus. Att. α 20, tacitly accepting Bekker’s emendation *τούτωι ὅς*, which I discuss and reject below. For a full report see Jacoby’s apparatus and commentary to Cleidemus F 1.

30.
πρὸς τὸ τῆς Ἀγρᾷ mss τὸ τῆς Ἀγρᾷς Fust. τὸ ἐν Ἀγρᾷ schol., Burnet τὰ ἐν Ἀγρᾷ
Bratuschek. Burnet and others, after the scholiast, take the phrase to mean “the [shrine] in Agra.” The mss. reading has been defended, but for wrong reasons. Verdenius (1955, 267–68) understands “the [shrine] lying in Agra”—a local genitive, though different from Chantraine’s. Wilamowitz (1919, 2.361) understands “the [shrine] of Agra,” a divine name like *Athena* / *Athenai* and the like. Similarly *LSJ* and *LSJ Rev. Suppl.* s.v. *οὔρα* III, the latter asserting that the shrine belongs to Demeter, not Artemis, which makes the divine name more puzzling still.

31. The frieze, found in the Ilissus bed nearby, shows the legends of the Palladium shrine and court. On one side, the Pelasgians assault Athenian girls, one of them beside the Palladium base. On the other, the Pelasgians have been condemned for premeditated crime and depart under sentence of exile. The temple design matches that of Athena Nike on the Acropolis, at another important entrance. See Robertson (1996b, 392–408; 2001, 39, 48–50).

32. So Judeich (1931, 45, 176, 416), Wycherley (1963, 174–75), Travlos (1971, 289, 291 fig. 379, conjectural locations nos. 150–52, 156), Billot (1992, 121, 128). Chantraine (1966, 1) inferred from the name that the area was “full of game” (*giboyeuse*).

33. According to Judeich (1931, 419) and, doubtfully, Wycherley (1963, 175), Poseidon’s shrine must be sought somewhere else on this hill, but Cleidemus specifies the summit. Travlos (1971, 114 fig. 154, 291 fig. 379) puts Poseidon on the hill above the Stuart and Revett temple—which does not satisfy the indication, either.

34. There is a suitable hill right beside the Ilissus, above the church and square of *Ayios Panteleēmōn*.

35.

Κρόνιον τέμενος· τὸ παρὰ τὸ νῦν Ὀλύμπιον μέχρι τοῦ Μητρώου τοῦ ἐν Ἀγραι (Wachsmuth *ἀγορεύει* ms.).

36. If this temple stood within the Hadrianic enclosure, as Pausanias very plainly says, it has not been found. Travlos (1971, 335–39) fixes on a Roman temple closer to the Ilissus bank than to the enclosure. J. Binder, as she kindly informs me, thinks rather of the Classical temple outside the south wall of the enclosure—which is conventionally assigned to Apollo *delphinios* but for no good reason.

37. *Κλείδημος δὲ Πέαν* / *Μητέρα θεῶν* (suppl. Nauck) = Philodemus *De Piet.*, *PHerc* fr. 3.23–24. Obbink (1994, 114–22) presents an authoritative text of the whole passage.

38.

Διὸς ἑορτὴ μελιχίου μεγίστη . . . ἐν ἣι πανδημεὶ θύουσι πολλοὶ κτλ.

Jameson (1965, 165–66) explains and vindicates the text, sometimes altered by editors.

39. Daux (1963, 604–12 A 37–43; 1983, 152–54 lines 34–35). Erchia also sends offerings to several civic deities on 12 *Metageitnion*, but this is not a festival day, nor do the deities consort with each other, so that demesmen must have come to Athens for some other purpose, probably to vote: Robertson (1992, 112). The provision of meals as needed or warranted was often an important function of a sacrificial calendar.

40. Thuc. 1.126.6, schol. *ad loc.*, Poll. 1.26, Ar. *Nub.* 408–9, with Jameson (1965, 165–66). It was once a standard view, still repeated by W. Burkert at *CAH*² 5.255, that the sacrifices were chiefly by way of holocaust. This is amply refuted by Jameson (1965, 162–65). Note however that Xenophon’s account of sacrificing to Zeus *milichios* is not directly relevant; it refers to the later season ([chapter 12](#), pp. 193–94).

41. It has often been objected that Dark Age “villages” can be traced archaeologically at scattered places round the Acropolis, and especially at the northwest, in the region of the Classical Agora. The material there has been misinterpreted, as we shall see in [chapter 13](#), apropos of the opposite district that belongs to harvest time.

42. This ritual text is undoubtedly in calendar format; “in the month *Gamelion*” is plainly read at A 16. Yet the order is puzzling—it has defied explanation. (See also *LSG* 1.1, with add., *LSCG* 1, *SEG* 49.54bis+; D. M. Lewis on *IG* i³ 234 is too laconic.) Perhaps it is by four trimesters and two series of annual and biennial observances, as in the calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis, but with each

trimester separately divided into the two series. A 1–23 is then part of the trimester *Gamelion*, *Anthesterion*, *Elaphebolion*. The sacrifices to Zeus *milichios* and the Mother at A 3–6 are the last of the annual series, in *Anthesterion* and *Elaphebolion*, and are followed at once in A 6–7 by the biennial heading and the god Di[onysus]:

[- - - τῶι τρ] - / [ἰ] τοι ἔτει Δι[ονύσοι] (τρίτοι

ἔτει Prott, *Διονύσοι* Sokolowski). Dionysus of “trieteric” fame is the god we most expect to hear of in this context. Yet the biennial series begins only in A 16–23, with the month *Gamelion* and offerings to Dionysus and Semel[e] and to Zeus *heraios*, obviously at the *Lenaia* and the *Theogamia*, respectively. What of A 7–23, between the biennial heading and the biennial series? These nine lines contain no date but rather the word ἵπαν “whenever” (A 8) and mention of Di[onysus], *Kurotrophos*, *heros* and *heroine*, Artemis. It is likely that they lay down general practices for the trimester.

43. For the *ἑλικ*- nomenclature see Robertson (1992, 30–31; 2002, 20–21). *Ταυρέων* is widely attested in Ionian calendars and is firmly placed in those of Samos and Miletus: Trümpy (1997, 78–80, 88–99). Trümpy (1997, 14–25, 35, 38) thinks of it as a standard name for April in a hypothetical Ur-calendar, alternating with *Artemision*, also common, and with Athens’ *Munichion*. It may be doubted, however, whether a calendar of month names was ever propagated as such (except from a mother city to its colonies); it was the festivals behind each local calendar that were propagated. The festival *Taurea*—evoked by Homer and celebrated in a great reunion first at Mycale, later at Ephesus—typifies the Ionians as an *ethnos*, just as the festival *Karneia* typifies the Dorians: Robertson (2002, 17–22, 25–27). The shrine and festival of Artemis for which the month is named at Athens are cognate rather with other east-coast shrines of Artemis in the homeland.

44. *μίμημα τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον* “a rendering of the matter of Dionysus” (Steph. Byz. s. *Ἄγρα καὶ Ἄγραι*). Deubner (1932, 70) doubtfully mentions Iacchus, but he has no story except for his nursing, in which he is assimilated to Dionysus. Deubner is also astray in speaking of “pantomime performances”; the words quoted from Stephanus are the usual language of aetiology.

45. Robertson (1992, 22–25; 2005).

46. Robertson (1986, 162–63). Remains of the palaestra and bath of the *Lykeion* gymnasium, as they appear to be, were excavated in 1996 at the north end of Rigillis Street, not far from the Ilissus and *Agra*: E. Ligouri in AR 1996/97, 8–10.

47. *Thes.* 27 = Hellanicus *FGrH* 323a F 17, Cleidemus 323 F 18.

48. Jameson (1980, 223–35) gathers the meager evidence for Apollo *lykeios* at Athens and draws a contrast with the robust figure at Argos and elsewhere. On Apollo and his festivals as differentiating Ionians and Dorians, see Robertson (2002, 31–36).

49. We should not suppose that the offering was vowed, or the battle fought, on 6 *Boedromion* of 490 B.C. That would be an extraordinary coincidence, since the Polemarch’s tribute was due on this day in any case.

50. Iasus, however, with thirteen odd, or oddly assorted, month names has two otherwise unique to Athens, *Elaphebolion* and *Skirophorion*: Trümpy (1997, 114–17). And *Skirophorion* is the only month name attested at Miletupolis near Cyzicus, with certain other Athenian names: SEG 33.1072, 49.1764, Parker (2005c, 484–85).

51. Triimpy (1997, 26n103, 136, 139, 199–202, 185).

Before the Harvest

Synopsis

The *myskos* “pollution” announced by the phrase “in [the land] of *Myskos*” is the very reason for worshipping Zeus *milichios* at this time of year. The spring weather needed for new growth is uncertain and causes much anxiety: it is thought to depend on the worthiness or purity of the community. If there is some pollution, and this is always likely, Zeus *milichios* is “appeasable,” the meaning of his title. So the whole community gathers on a large campground, the land of *Myskos*, for the effort. The custom gives rise to stories about some terrible pollution of the past in which Zeus *milichios* was concerned—and was finally appeased. Cylon of Athens brought pollution on his city when he attempted to gain power by seizing the Acropolis; he acted on the very day of the festival of Zeus *milichios*, and blood was shed two or three days later at the festival of the *Semnai Theai*. Yet the god was finally appeased when the people set up a statue of Cylon on the Acropolis. Pausanias of Sparta, Euthycles of Locri, Bryas of Argos—each of them somehow brought pollution on his city until Zeus was finally appeased, either by a statue of the offender or by a statue of himself. In a contrasting story, Empedocles removed pollution from Selinus and was worshipped as a very god at the festival site. All such fictions illustrate the true nature of the cult as addressing a seasonal concern. They forbid us to suppose that Selinus was actually plunged in bloody murder just before the tablet was inscribed.

The Athenian Festival

Turning again to Athens, we find that pollution, or rather the fear of it, was in the air in early spring. It is true that the festival *Diasia* of 23 *Anthestêriôn* = February was known for feasting and family fun.¹ From literary mentions we would never suspect a dark side. But antiquarian comment describes it succinctly as a festival

“ἦν ἐπιτέλουν μετὰ τινος στυγνότητος” which they conducted with a certain gloominess.”² Feasting and fun, it seems, were in defiance of some imagined threat. Ordinary people forgot the imagined threat. This day in Athens’ calendar is very close to Carnival days in the Western church and to Meat Sunday and the like in the Eastern. Feasting before Lent is also defiant; church doctrine, however, does not allow us to forget it.

The name *Διάσια* shows that the festival time was all important. It is a redundant form of *Δῖα* based on the locative **Δίασι* “at Zeus-rites.”³ This locative, in producing the festival name, was once widely used, and at a very early date—it is the only example of a locative neuter plural, or almost.⁴ “At Zeus-rites” was a special time, like Carnival.⁵ The epithet *μελίσχιος* used of Zeus at this time and again at the harvest is doubly expressive. As Nilsson observes, “it comes from *μελίσσω* and accordingly denotes not simply ‘the kindly one,’ ‘the gracious one,’ but one who has been rendered kindly and gracious (through appeasement).”⁶

The Death of Cylon or of His Followers as Festival *Aition*

The festival is bound up in story with a great event of Athenian history, indeed with its earliest definite event, the failed coup of the aspiring tyrant Cylon. Cylon is also the first individual Athenian we truly know, an Olympic victor of 640 B.C., son-in-law of the tyrant Theagenes of Megara, commemorated by a bronze statue on the Acropolis that somehow survived to the time of Pausanias.⁷ With a band of supporters he attempted to seize the Acropolis—but the people of Athens did not rise behind him as he hoped, and the authorities prevailed. The rest of the story is full of vivid detail about the bloody reprisal and the pollution it brought upon the city, which was felt for some two hundred years, being called either *τὸ Κυλώνειον ἄγος* “Cylon’s pollution” or *τὸ ἄγος τῆς θεοῦ* “the pollution of the goddess” (probably an objective genitive).⁸ Among the various sources for Cylon’s coup, only Thucydides mentions the festival *Diasia* and only as an opportunity that Cylon failed to grasp: the Delphic oracle appointed this day for his venture, and he misunderstood (1.126.4-6). But the festival, as we shall see, is implicit in Herodotus as well, so that Thucydides insists on a mere variation.

We must consider how and why the story was handed down. And to begin with, we must consider a separate tradition concerning the measures taken to remove the pollution. This tradition, associated with the great names of Solon and Epimenides, is represented by the broken beginning of [Aristotle’s] *Constitution of Athens* and by

Plutarch's *Life of Solon*, [chapter 12](#). Measures were taken within a few decades, at most, of the event. Members of the family Alcmaeonidae, leading one of two principal factions in the 590s B.c., were held polluted because Megacles, a forebear, had been chief archon, the one person most responsible for killing the offenders.⁹ At Solon's instigation they were put on trial and condemned; living members were banished, and graves of the dead were dug up. A little later, with Athenians still fearful, Epimenides purified the city and among other religious measures instituted the cult of the *Semnai Theai*. Whereas the Alcmaeonidae had incurred a particular pollution because of Megacles, Athenians at large felt a general pollution.

Another measure was overlooked by this tradition. Pausanias in touring the Acropolis is surprised to find a statue of Cylon as a public dedication in the northwest sector, west of Athena's Ionic temple, the Old Temple so called (1.28.1).¹⁰ His words

Κύλωνα . . . χαλκοῦν ἀνέθεσαν "[the Athenians] set up a bronze Cylon" perhaps echo the inscription on the base. If this is an Archaic original, it was removed to safety in 480–479 B.c., like the bronze Hermes *agoraios* dedicated in the late Archaic period by archon Cebrius.¹¹ Otherwise, the Athenians made sure of replacing an essential monument—and produced a faithful copy, an ideal *kuros*, for Pausanias conjectures that Cylon deserved the unexpected tribute as

being *εἶδος κάλλιστος* "a supremely handsome figure."¹² The statue on the Acropolis, as plainly as Epimenides' intervention, is a remedy for a general pollution felt by the people.¹³ We shall find just the same remedy for a pollution just as general at Sparta, Locri, and Argos: statues dedicated by the people, representing either offenders like Cylon or else Zeus *milichios* himself.

Cylon's coup is recounted by Herodotus and Thucydides so as to illustrate the inherited pollution as it bears on events of 507 and 431 B.c. respectively; Cleisthenes and Pericles are especially polluted. In 507 the Alcmaeonidae were back in Athens, Cleisthenes among them, but according to Herodotus they were again held polluted, again by an opposing faction. It became a pretext, he says, for Cleomenes to intervene in favor of Isagoras (5. 70.2–72.1, echoed by [Arist.] *Ath.* 20.2–3). Both Cleisthenes and his supporters, seven hundred households denounced by Isagoras, were expelled from Athens because of the pollution.¹⁴ Herodotus tells the story of Cylon briefly, with a couple of interesting details—and yet he does not mention the board of archons, much less Megacles. So the story does not after all explain why Cleomenes and his supporters are vulnerable, rather than Athenians at large or an unknown number of Athenians. The supporters can be polluted, or more polluted than the rest of the city, only if they too descend from Megacles or from other members of that

board of archons. Either proposition would entail an extraordinary continuity of declared interest and allegiance over more than a century.¹⁵

In 431 B.c., says Thucydides, the Spartans called on the Athenians *τὸ ἄγος ἐλαύνειν τῆς θεοῦ* “to drive out the pollution of the goddess,” a phrase twice repeated and then varied as *περὶ τῶν ἐναγῶν τῆς ἐλάσεως* “concerning the expulsion of those polluted” (1.126.2, 127.1, 139.1). He also says that the Spartans were aiming especially at Pericles, since he was a blood relation through his mother (127.1–3). The Athenians in reply called on the Spartans to drive out their own pollution, both that from Taenarus and that of the goddess Athena, in similar phrases to be quoted below (128.1–2, 135.1). Such phrases must have been used at the time by both sides. So Thucydides tells the story of Cylon at length, quite differently from Herodotus, with many interesting details (126.3–11); he also mentions the episode of 507 B.C. (126.12); it is obvious that he means to correct his predecessor. The nine archons are singled out as responsible for the killing, and all those expelled in 507 are said to be descendants—this is a view perhaps implied by Herodotus, as we just saw, but at variance with the tradition in [Aristotle] and Plutarch. Now, in 431, descendants are living in the city still. And yet, although Pericles is said to be a special target, Thucydides does not mention the chief archon from whom he descends. So intent he is on correcting Herodotus.

The usual understanding of Herodotus and Thucydides is that in 507 and in 431, just as in the 590s, the particular pollution attaching to the Alcmaeonidae was still a matter of lively debate, issuing in different versions of the story of Cylon.¹⁶ Yet neither version is suited to the purpose. It is also assumed that the fear of general pollution, which in the 590s continued after the Alcmaeonidae were expelled, was wholly absent in 507 and 431. Yet the fear might well be awakened by the Spartan demand, just as the Athenian demand could only awaken the same fear at Sparta. And the statue on the Acropolis still bore testimony. Herodotus and Thucydides deserve a closer reading. We shall see that the rival versions display no partisan intent. It is simply that Cylon himself, and the fear of pollution and the religious customs pertaining to it, were of abiding interest.

Thucydides must be taken first, since he is much fuller and supplies some omissions in Herodotus (1.126.2–127.1).¹⁷ Cylon inquired of the Delphic oracle; “seize the Acropolis of Athens at the greatest festival of Zeus” was the reply. Cylon thought only of the Olympic Games, being himself an Olympic victor, but Athens’ festival *Diasia* was meant—a brief description of the *Diasia* is added for the benefit of readers outside of Athens and in the future. Cylon therefore

acted at the time of the Olympic festival. When people heard that the Acropolis had been seized, they rushed against the enemy “*en masse* from the countryside.” There followed a long siege of the Acropolis, with the impetuous people soon tiring of it and entrusting the outcome, as was proper, to the nine archons. Cylon and his brother escaped, and the siege ended with the other Cylonians perishing of hunger and taking refuge at Athena’s altar, from which they were removed by the archons under safe conduct, and yet were killed by them, even those who took refuge once more, this time at the altars of the *Semnai Theai*.

It is a good story, with an oracle fatally misunderstood. Had Cylon acted on the day of the *Diasia*, success would have followed. Acting instead at the time of the Olympic Games, he failed, and the full consequence was visited on the Cylonians at the altars of the *Semnai Theai*. Athenians did not need to be reminded of the calendar (whereas modern readers, even modern scholars, are oblivious of the calendar). The day of the *Diasia* is 23 *Anthestêrion*; the Olympic Games are held about six months later; the day of the festival of the *Semnai Theai*, on the reckoning in [chapter 8](#), is most likely 25 or 26 *Anthestêrion*. After failing at the time of the Olympic Games, the Cylonians persevere for about six months in order to meet that terrible end at the time of the festival of the *Semnai Theai*. A third of the story, over a dozen lines, is taken up by their protracted ordeal: the steady and determined effort of the authorities, the privation and suffering of the besieged, also the escape of Cylon himself and his brother, which makes the killing of their followers more pitiful.

Herodotus gives us just seven lines in all (5.70.2–72.1). Cylon with some fellow conspirators failed at once in their attempt to seize the Acropolis, took refuge at Athena’s statue, and were removed, with a promise to spare their lives, by “the *prytaneis* of the *naukraroi*”—only to be killed. Let us complete the story from Thucydides. The killing was done—as always, not only in Thucydides—at the neighboring shrine of the *Semnai Theai*. This story too evokes the festival of 25 or 26 *Anthestêrion*. Cylon acted just before. Herodotus says nothing of a special day or of a gathering of people, but these things are not excluded: he acted on the day of the *Diasia*, 23 *Anthestêrion*. He hoped for immediate support from the huge festival crowd, drawn from the whole of Attica, but in vain; Cylon and his fellows became suppliants. Since people were grouped on just that day, at the huge campground of *Agra*, in the twelve territorial units called *naukrariai*, the chiefs of these units, who came from the respective parts of Attica, took charge of negotiating the surrender.¹⁸ Afterwards the terms were violated by the city officers, the board of archons.

When Herodotus’ version is thus completed, we see that

Thucydides' version is secondary. In this version Cylon seizes the Acropolis on no special day at Athens, merely at the time of the Olympic Games. Yet all at once there is a great concourse of people.

οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι αἰσθόμενοι ἐβόηθησάν τε πανδημεὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν ἐπ' αὐτούς "the Athenians, when they heard of it, rushed to arms *en masse* from the countryside against them" (126.7). This amazing reaction does not really change the course of the story. The people lay siege to the Acropolis, they weary of it, they go away—but after entrusting the business to the archons, who kill the Cylonians at the due time. The very language is derivative. πανδημεὶ recalls the description of the *Diasia*, the neglected opportunity, just three lines before: people attending the festival gather πανδημεὶ outside the city. The location, ἐν Ἄγρᾳ is omitted by Thucydides in his description of the festival, being of no concern to readers outside of Athens and in the future.¹⁹ In the prior version, the people rushed, or perhaps it was only that they might have rushed. πανδημεὶ ἐξ Ἄγρᾳ Instead, it is now πανδημεὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν²⁰ The substitute phrase, meaning "from the countryside," has its own point, as we might expect. It is faithful to the conditions of early days, in Attica as elsewhere, when people were more dispersed, perhaps living on their farms (Thuc. 2.16.1, Arist. Pol. 5, 1305a 18-21), and when they knew only military leaders, leaders of the sort who aimed at tyranny (so Aristotle).

The two versions are both plausible in different ways. That of Herodotus may well start from the truth, a misplaced hope for a festival day—unless the misplaced hope was itself only an embellishment. That of Thucydides neatly substitutes a misunderstood oracle; the misunderstanding is due to Cylon's prepossession for the Olympic Games, a notorious fact. It also takes care to remind us of something often forgotten, that people then were at home in οἱ ἀγροί which also happens to echo the festival location Ἄγρα. We should not suppose that the stories as commonly told were much more elaborate than what we read in Thucydides and infer from Herodotus. They do not speak to any partisan interest, either for or against the Alcmaeonidae.

Herodotus, as every reader knows, introduces the Alcmaeonidae, the family and its leading members, at many junctures and mostly to their credit; he will not hear of slanderous imputations, as that they favored tyrants or Persians. Thucydides represents Pericles as the driving force in Athens' acceptance and prosecution of the Peloponnesian War. They are both too partial to their heroes. In 507 B.C. the public fact is that a Spartan king came to Athens to drive out a great many people denounced as polluted. In 431 B.C. the public fact is

that the Spartans called on Athens to drive out “the pollution of the goddess,” which is a general pollution, falling on the whole city, focused on its center, the Acropolis.

The Death of the Regent Pausanias

In 431 B.C. there are really two public facts: the Spartans called on Athens to drive out “the pollution of the goddess,” and the Athenians, replying in kind, called on Sparta to drive out “the pollution from Taenarus” and “the pollution of the goddess *chalkioikos*.” The two counterphrases used by the Athenians undoubtedly express a general pollution. The Spartans at large, not any Spartan leader, incurred pollution from the murder of suppliant helots at Taenarum and from the cruel death of Pausanias as a suppliant of Athena *chalkioikos*.²¹ Pausanias’ case is much like Cylon’s. The shrine where Pausanias took refuge is Sparta’s acropolis shrine of Athena. In this acropolis shrine, as a professed remedy for the ensuing pollution, the Spartans set up two bronze statues of Pausanias that stood there down to the time of our other Pausanias (3.17.7, 9, 18.1, cf. Thuc. 1.134.4, etc.).²²

The death of Pausanias was also somehow redeemed by the cult now instituted of a power named *epidotas* “increaser”: so says our other Pausanias without further detail (3.17.9). This is in fact an epithet of Zeus at Sparta (Hsch. s.v.); on Amorgos the epithet takes the form *anadotes* (IG 12.7.91). It is Zeus *milichios* again; the “appeasable” god is also an “increaser” of crops. The same meaning— “increaser” or “getter”—is expressed by the commoner epithets *ktesios* and *pasios*, and these in turn are applied to the kindly snake god approached by his worshippers in votive reliefs.²³ The kindly snake god is not quite identical with Zeus *milichios*, being worshipped separately by each household and not on any collective occasion—not quite identical but very nearly. Plutarch names *epidotes* and *milichios* together as lesser powers contrasting with Zeus proper, the potentate in the sky (*Non posse suaviter vivi* 22, 1102e).

The Death of Similar Offenders at Locri, Argos, and Elsewhere

Callimachus, *Aetia* Book Three, told the story of Euthycles of Locri, an Olympic victor in the *pentathlon* and thus comparable to Cylon, victor in the *diaulos* in 640 B.c. (frs. 83–84).²⁴ Euthycles was thought, wrongly, to have betrayed his city and was imprisoned and seemingly done to death. The Locrians also mistreated his statue, and Zeus was wroth to see it, and they were visited with plague or famine.²⁵ The remedy was to honor the statue of Euthycles as if it were of Zeus, and

to construct an altar and offer sacrifice at a stated time, which unfortunately is not preserved.²⁶ The statue of Euthycles, like those of Pausanias, is said to serve as atonement. But it is also equated with a statue of Zeus himself and is the object of worship. We are reminded of the *milichios* stones at Selinus, which belong to individuals and sometimes crudely represent a person's form and were the object of worship, to judge from traces on the ground.²⁷ At Croton, not so far from Locri, a *milichios* stone was set up by the famous athlete Phayllus or a namesake (*LSAG*² p. 261 no. 22).

At Argos Pausanias found a statue of Zeus *milichios* in the agora, a seated figure by Polycleitus, whether elder or younger (2.20.1-2). It was supposedly meant to expiate the bloodshed of a popular victory when a band of oligarchs were slain, and especially their ravaging insolent leader, well named *Bryas* "Abounding." The occasion described by Pausanias is barely recognizable as an actual event of summer 417 B.C. (Thuc. 5.82.2, Diod. 12.80.2-3, Plut. *Alcib.* 15.3-4). This statue of Zeus *milichios* lent itself to imaginary reminiscence. At Sicyon, too, let us note by the way, Pausanias found a statue of Zeus *milichios* in the agora (2.9.6).²⁸ But being aniconic, in the form of a pyramid, and being accompanied by a statue of Artemis *patroia* in the form of a column, it did not inspire any story that we hear of. The pyramid shape at Sicyon is clearly a collective version of the crude *milichios* stones set up by individuals.²⁹

We should notice too a purely imaginary instance supplied by the abundant imagination of the historian Timaeus. He starts from the simple fact that the colony of Siris in Italy, perhaps Ionian as well as Achaean, was destroyed in the later sixth century by its largely Achaean neighbors Metapontum and Croton. The worst of it, says Timaeus, was that fifty youths and a young priest were slaughtered as they embraced the statue of Athena on the acropolis, a famous statue said to be the very one carried off from the citadel of Troy (Lycophr. *Alex.* 984-92, Str. 6.1.14, p. 264, Just. 20.2.4).³⁰ Both the offending cities were struck by pestilence; both were told by the Delphic oracle to set up statues of all the slain (Just. 20.2.5-8). Croton took great care in their manufacture, whereas Metapontum worked with the utmost dispatch. After such different but equal efforts both cities found relief. Timaeus lived for more than fifty years at Athens, where the story of Cylon was famous and the statue on the Acropolis depicted a beautiful youth.³¹ When he told a corresponding story of Siris (joining it to the story of Troy's *palladion*) and of the sequel at Metapontum and Croton, he sowed with the whole sack. In distinguishing two kinds of statue, those of the finest workmanship and others made in haste, and in asserting that both were of equal effect, he surely thought of images of Zeus *milichios*, which are of both

kinds and express equal devotion.

Empedocles at Selinus

Selinus has its own story of pollution and death, of a marvelous remedy, of the festival celebration that ensued. The story is aetiological, and the details point to the spring festival of Zeus *milichios*—and also identify the festival site, the land of *Myskos*.

Diogenes Laertius transmits the story from an unknown source, with several others about the strange, contested disappearance of Empedocles (8.70). It explains how he came to be thought a god, so that “wishing to confirm this impression he leapt into the fire.” But his virtual epiphany is the main point, and its connexion with the leap is secondary.³² “A plague befell the people of Selinus because of the stench from the river that ran past, so that they were perishing and women were miscarrying. Empedocles took note and at his own expense *δος τιναο ποταμοσο των σονεγγνο ιπαγαγεον* brought on a certain pair of neighbouring rivers. And by mixing them he sweetened the streams. When the plague thus abated and the people of Selinus were feasting one day beside the river, Empedocles *ιπιφανηται* revealed himself. They rose up and did obeisance and *προσεοχεσθαι καθαπερο θεωι* prayed to him just as if he were a god.”³³

In Sicily and southern Italy swamps were sometimes a source of pollution, not less feared for being real. At Selinus the valley east of the city, the *Gorgo di Cottone*, is swampy lowland.³⁴ The stream *Cottone* that runs through it is formed by the confluence of two tributary streams running down from the hills. It is the setting of the story: people at Selinus worship on the far bank of the *Cottone*, as Athenians do on the far bank of the *Ilissus*. In spring the stream flows with fresh water, and the festival of Zeus *milichios* is celebrated beside it. Empedocles is given credit for making the stream flow and for being Zeus *milichios*. Here then is the land of *Myskos* “Pollution.”

The festival of Zeus *milichios*, whether at Selinus or nearby Acragas or elsewhere, is behind another story of Empedocles which Diogenes Laertius shares with Athenaeus (Diog. Laert. 8.53, Ath. 1.5, 3E).³⁵ When Empedocles won a victory at Olympia, he did not, like other magnates, feast the crowd with a sacrifice of oxen. Instead, being a vegetarian, he provided a large costly cake shaped like an ox.³⁶ Vegetarian principle alone could not suggest such a curious substitute. It implies a custom like that of Athens’ *Diasia*, of offering cakes shaped like animal victims.

1. Ar. *Nub.* 408–11, 864, Luc. 25 *Tim.* 7; cf. Deubner (1932, 156). Despite

Jameson (1965, 162n), Lucian is not valueless because he had no direct knowledge of the festival; he drew on Attic comedy and gives a corresponding picture.

2. Scholl. Luc. 24 *Icaromen*. 24,25 *Timon* 7, Hesch. *s. Διάσια*. Other comments to similar effect are plainly derivative. Beside one such, in schol. Rav. Ar. *Nub.* 408, it is strangely said that “Apollonius of Acharnae distinguishes the *Diasia* from the festival of Zeus *milichios*” (FGrH 365 F 5). We might suppose that he dissociated one or other from the gloominess. Apollonius’ credentials are slighter than Jacoby thought (chapter 3, note 13).

3. The festival of *Anthestériōn* is *Διάσια* on Thasos (LSSuppl. 69.2) but *Δία* at Teos (GHI² 30 B 34). *Εκαλήσια* is a comparable name for another festival of Zeus, at the coordinate season after the harvest (cf. chapter 3, pp.

48–49). It is based on the place name *Εκάλη* (perhaps “Far away”), which could have a locative **Εκάλησι* like e.g. *Παλλήνη* / *Παλλήνησι*. But this festival name alternates locally with the expected form **Εκάλεια* (whence the attested epithet *Εκαλεῖος*) So *Εκαλήσια* probably arose by analogy with *Διάσια*.

4. *Ὀλυμπίασι* generally means “at Olympia,” serving as a locative of *Ὀλυμπία* and thus corresponding to *Πυθοί, Νεμέαι* and the like. But the form shows that it originates as a locative of *Ὀλύμπια* “Olympian [rites],” matching *s. μείλιχος*. (chapter 5, note 47).

5. Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 2.154–55 explains and illustrates the temporal force of such locatives, going back to Indo-European.

6. Nilsson (1955.411). The etymology is unknown, for *μέλι* seems unrelated (Frisk, *GEW*, add. *s. μείλια*). Chantraine, *DELG s. μεζλια*.

7. Olympic victory: Moretti (1957 no. 56). It is a time at which Olympic records can be relied on, as they cannot be for dates reaching back to the early seventh century and the eighth. See Rhodes (1981, 81–82) for criticism of several attempts to lower Cylon’s date.

8. Parker (1983, 7, 145n8) inclines to the view that “the *agos* of the goddess” is rather the curse she inflicts, subjective genitive. It is hard to decide. If Athenians or Spartans “drive out the *agos*,” is it the persons who offend the goddess or those whom she curses?

9. The possible dates for Megacles’ archonship and the coup are the Olympic years from 636/5 to 624/3 b.c. (Develin [1989, 30]).

10. Among the statues hereabouts Pausanias remarks “ancient images of Athena” that survived the Persian sack with only slight disfigurement (1.27.6); the Marathonian bull (27.10); and the bronze chariot commemorating the victory of 508 B.C. (28.2). These last two come just before and just after Cylon and Athena Promachus (28.1). The bronze chariot is demonstrably a replacement, and the Marathonian bull is often thought to be so too, but Morris (1992, 339–41) argues that Theseus’ geste was more likely to be so commemorated in the years after the Persian Wars.

11. Hermes *agoraios*: Wycherley (1957, 102–3 nos. 296–300). His altar has now been uncovered by the agora excavators (but is wrongly identified as Aphrodite’s); the small Roman temple that faces it was perhaps meant to house the statue, much admired at the time. See Robertson (2005, 88).

12. Judeich (1931, 246?3) thinks of a replacement (and rejects the view of A. Schafer and others that this statue was set up at about the same time as the two in

Sparta of Pausanias the regent). Jacoby (1949, 369n88) holds that there was no inscription, which creates a needless difficulty: the statue might have represented anyone.

13. Jameson (1965, 170–71) rightly speaks of “atonement for taking the life of a suppliant, since a victor’s dedication is unlikely in the late seventh century.”

14. The seven hundred households figure largely in modern calculations. They should not. “Seven hundred” is a typical number for Herodotus, sounding plausible or informed (Fehling [1989, 226]). Before Herodotus, the story may well have said “very many.”

15. This conclusion, in respect to Megacles, is firmly embraced by Davies (1971, 370) and Dickie (1979, 201–2). In 507 B.C. many of those incriminated, far from being Alcmaeonidae proper, “must have been ‘Alkmeonid’ only in the sense that Perikles was, through near or *remote* distaff descent” (Davies, with my emphasis).

16. Rhodes (1981, 79–84) provides a thorough review. The debate has been thought to continue even in the fourth century: Jacoby on Cleidemus *FGrH* 323 F 7–8 suggests that this Attic chronicler is behind “the decided apology for the Alcmaeonids” in Plut. *Sol.* 12.

17. In large part I follow Jameson (1965, 167–72), who shows that Thucydides’ account of Cylon failing to act on the day of the *Diasia* implies another account in which he did so and that this account is behind Herodotus. His conclusions are accepted by Rhodes (1981, 80, 82) and by A. Andrewes, *CAH*² 3.3 (1982, 369). It only needs to be added that both accounts turn also on the proximate day of the festival of the *Semnai Theai*.

18. At the *Diasia* the attendance is later grouped by deme: Erchia provides a sheep (Daux 1963 = *SEG* 21.541 A 37–43), and so does Thoricus (Daux 1983 = *SEG* 33.147 = Lupu 2005 no. 1 lines 34–35). It was formerly grouped by *naukraria* since this unit is replaced by the deme ([Arist.] *Ath.* 21.5). So Jameson (1965, 169).

19. As a matter of possible interest, the festival ground is close to the domains of the Alcmaeonidae. Family members belong to the contiguous demes

Xypeté, Alôpekê, and Agrylê south of the Ilissus (Davies [1971, 384]), the last perhaps including *Agra*.

20. Note, however, as against Jameson (1965, 167) and Rhodes (1981, 80), that the very words *ἐκ τῶν Ἀγρῶν* could not be used with the same meaning as *ἐξ Ἀγρας* (I owe this point to R. Parker, who does not hold with the foregoing account of the two versions.)

21. At Sparta the board of ephors are directly responsible for the cruel death (Thuc. 1.134.1–4), just as the board of archons or the chiefs of the *naukraroi* were at Athens. Yet at Sparta this detail does not restrict the scope of pollution.

22. In a different episode, mostly told for its own sake, Pausanias the regent took the life of a maiden of Byzantium and brought madness and pollution on himself. It is only our Pausanias who associates this episode with the suppliant drama at Athena’s shrine: so Wide (1893, 14–17), quite conclusively. Jameson (1965, 170) errs in upholding Pausanias’ combination of stories.

23. Wide (1893, 15) rightly compared “the chthonic *plusios* and *ktesios*.” Others are astray, e.g. Fonten-rose (1978, 131), who says of Hesychius’ entry, “probably this Zeus was identified with [Pausanias’] avenging daimon.”

24. D’Alessio (1996, 496–99) gives the text as now constituted.

25. A similar story is told of the statue of the Thasian athlete Theagenes, so as to explain the healing power ascribed to it (Luc. 52 *Deor. Conc.* 12, cf. Paus. 6.II.8).

26. τς μςν Ογαλμα τ[?ν Ον]θικλ[?]?ις κατ ‘ςσςν / τωι τςν Οιςο ετ[?μη]σαν, ετι δς και βω-/μςνπςιησαντε[?]. ,τ[.]. . [.]ν.[?]σταμς-/νςν μηςο (Diegesis 2.5–8). A day in the first decad of the month would suit Zeus milichios at harvest time (cf. chapters

12–13).

27. See JJK 90–91, 103–7, ‘33–36.

28. Perhaps the Locrian statue was indeed of Zeus and likewise stood in the agora, where it might be taken for the portrait of an athlete, despite the adjoining altar. Theagenes’ statue was in the agora of Thasos.

29. The *milichios* stones of Lebadeia have pyramid shapes not mentioned by JJK 84–85, 98–100 but emphasized by Lerat (1952, 2.146–47) and Schachter (1994, 119n3).

30. These are not attributed fragments of Timaeus but can be safely joined with *FGrH* 566 F 51–52 = Ath. 12.25, 523c–e, on the luxury and the legendary origins of Siris. So Giannelli (1963, 93–96), though he does not take in the episode of the pestilence and its remedy.

31. On the Athenian background, which is often evident in Timaeus, see Robertson (1996b, 432–33; 2001, 33, 36).

32. Diodorus of Ephesus *FGrH* 1102 F 1 is cited just before as saying that Anaximander imitated Empedocles’ godlike manner. Kingsley (1995, 272–77), who inadvertently ascribes our story to Diodorus, argues that Empedocles is here identified with Heracles—“an Empedoclean legend calqued on Heraclean mythology”—inasmuch as Heracles rechanneled a river, the Alpheiis, and was rewarded with a fiery apotheosis. The analogy seems rather strained.

33. These emphatic words are curiously like the emphatic expression *θν̄ςν̄τς* *Οἰσπερ τς? θεος* used at the beginning of line 17 in the tablet. (Here they refer to the pure *Tritopatreis*, not to Zeus *milichios*, whose entry immediately following begins in the usual way, with another *θν̄ςν̄τς* [see [chapter 1](#), p. 22 and [chapter 10](#), p. 164]). Suppose that the tablet was very well known. Might not the story say in effect that people worship faithfully according to its directions, doing so at a memorable moment?

34. *Sicilia* 258, De Angelis (2003, 129 fig. 41) (after D. Mertens). The swampy lowland has been extended by alluvium; between the city and the eastern hill there was once a harbor, as also between the city and the western hill.

35. Diogenes takes his brief account from Favorinus, but Athenaeus draws on some earlier, ampler source.

36. The same offering, an “ox of dough,” was transferred from Empedocles to Pythagoras at a late stage so as to palliate the story of his sacrificing an actual ox. See Burkert (1972b, 180n110).

Tritopatreis Foul and Pure

Synopsis

Column A, lines 9–17:

To the *Tritopatreis* who are foul [sacrifice] just as to the heroes, after pouring down wine through the roof, and of the portions that are ninths burn up one. Those who have the right shall sacrifice the victim and shall consecrate. And after sprinkling round they shall smear over.

And then to those who are pure they shall sacrifice a full-grown victim, pouring down honey-mix. And [one shall set up] a table and a couch, and one shall place thereon a clean cloth and crowns of olive and honey-mix in new cups and cakes and meat. And they shall burn them up as firstlings, and shall smear over after putting in the cups. They shall sacrifice just as to the gods the ancestral victims.

Worship is prescribed for *Tritopatreis* “Third-fathers,” a mysterious group of deities whose name and nature and distribution are discussed in [chapter 11](#). The setting is a distinctive shrine with a sunken chamber that receives both libations and burnt portions of animal victims, just as an altar does in normal worship. The sunken chamber is a way of reaching the deities, who are underground but not far off. There are two kinds of *Tritopatreis*, foul and pure, to be approached with similar but contrasting rites. The foul kind are expected to remain below, but the pure kind will emerge for a while and enjoy the familiar rite of table hospitality in company with the worshippers. The rites for foul and pure *Tritopatreis* are performed successively, but otherwise the time is according to need and discretion. It is clear, however, that the *Tritopatreis* receive their due after the two festivals of early spring addressed to the *Eumenides* and to Zeus *milichios* and before the tribute to Zeus *milichios* in early summer, after the harvest. We shall see in [chapter 11](#) that calendar evidence elsewhere assigns the *Tritopatreis* to just this season, from April to June. Now in contrast to the previous entries for the *Eumenides* and Zeus *milichios*, which are of the briefest, the entry for *Tritopatreis* is full of meticulous detail; so is the next entry for Zeus *milichios*. The disparity arises because the

first two were public festivals where general custom showed the way, and these two are private undertakings where guidance is necessary. For both, the ritual instructions are perhaps the most elaborate and complete that can be found in Greek documents. They enlighten us in matters such as the meaning of “ninth” that have a bearing on other ritual as well.

“Foul” and “Pure”

The ritual is similar for “foul” and “pure” *Tritopatreis* but ampler and more sociable for the pure, and the difference is said to be as between “heroes” and “gods.” For the foul kind, the ritual is partly in the hands of a privileged group, a priestly clan exercising a special skill, but for the pure kind this ministration is dispensed with. Now *Tritopatreis* are generally thought to be deified ancestors or gods representing ancestors, so that “foul” and “pure” describe them, respectively, as polluted or not by bloodshed. The question is put whether these are two kinds of ancestor god, or the same kind first polluted and then purified—a like question must be put of *Tritopatreis* however conceived.¹ The ritual for both is conducted at a sunken chamber, and it can also be asked whether this is the same place throughout, or two successive places. The answers adopted here are as follows.

It is very probable if not quite certain that these are two kinds of *Tritopatreis*, always distinct but worshipped at the same place. Let us appeal briefly to the archaeological and epigraphic evidence for *Tritopatreis* elsewhere, to be fully cited in [chapter 11](#). Descriptive labels like “foul” and “pure” do not occur. Shrines of *Tritopatreis* are sometimes—at Athens (in two or three cases), on Delos, at Cyrene—designated as belonging to a kinship group named for a common ancestor, i.e. a priestly clan. Otherwise, they appear to be public shrines belonging to the city—Athens, ῥTroezen—or to a local community—Erchia, Marathon. Yet it is always a single shrine, never a pair. The two excavated instances, outside the Sacred Gate at Athens and outside the precinct of Apollo on Delos, have a similar shape, a truncated triangle, and a similar setting. On Delos the shrine consists of a sunken chamber, and at Marathon it is perhaps referred to as “a well.” Again, nothing points to a pairing of shrines. But the dates attested epigraphically range over three months. At Erchia it is 21 *MunichiOn* = April; at Marathon it is just before the festival *Skira* in *Skirophorion* = June; at Athens it is in both *MunichiOn* and *Thargelion* = May. The different times may well pertain to different kinds of *Tritopatreis*, such as foul and pure. If foul turns to pure during these months, we think at once of the weather and other natural conditions. The different times are also conformable with the transitional phrase

The Place of Sacrifice

For both foul and pure *Tritopatreis*, sacrifice is offered at the same place, though not in quite the same way. Libation is poured, as at the beginning of almost any sacrifice; it is of wine and of honey-mix respectively.² It is *poured down*, the same unusual verb *ὑπολείβω* being used for both, but first in the aorist and then in the present tense, a conspicuous alternation that must be deliberate.³ The aorist indicates that libation is poured down once only, as the sacrifice begins, for the foul *Tritopatreis*. The present indicates that it is poured down for the pure *Tritopatreis* more than once, at the outset and again later. And in fact the ceremony for the pure *Tritopatreis* is more elaborate, with a presentation of table offerings. Probably libation is poured down a second time just before the deities partake, in imagination, of the table offerings. Libation is poured down *through the roof*, mentioned only once. We see that it goes through an opening, perhaps after a cap or door is lifted, into a low or sunken installation, a chamber or pit.

The pouring is a participle attached to the verb "sacrifice," which is only understood, not expressed, with the foul *Tritopatreis*. In the sequel the offerings are burnt up, a portion of the animal for the foul *Tritopatreis*, and for the pure *Tritopatreis* both meat and other food offerings. It has hitherto been assumed (but not argued) that the sacrificial procedure takes place at an altar.⁴ A more natural assumption is that it takes place beside the installation into which libation is poured, inasmuch as libation is otherwise poured out on an altar. The burnt offerings as well would then be destined for the installation. A point of language clinches it. In both cases, after the offerings are burnt up, there is a further operation usually thought of as sprinkling and anointing, but interpreted below as moistening and smearing, i.e. as a treatment of the burnt remains. Whatever it is, the operation applies also to the drinking cups, a part of the food offerings that is not combustible. Persons do this *τὰς ποτερίδας ἐνθέντες* "after putting in the cups" (line 16). There is nothing to put them in but the chamber or pit.⁵

It is agreed by all that a chamber or pit is used for the libations; so it is too for other offerings. How shall we envisage it? Surprisingly, the usual recourse has been not to the attested cult of *Tritopatreis* but to several things that are not likely to be related in any way.

JJK point to the agora of Poseidonia / Paestum and to its relatively large sunken stone chamber, distinctly roofed with pan tiles of stone but permanently closed and indeed covered with a mound of

earth, dated to the later sixth century.⁶ M. Rausch improves on the comparison by ascribing Paestum's chamber and precinct to a cult of *Tritopatreis* regarded as city founders.⁷ But traces of offerings in the precinct (not in the chamber permanently closed) show nothing distinctive. Excavated shrines of *Tritopatreis* at Athens and on Delos are nowhere near an agora and have no such structure with gable roof.

The true nature of Paestum's chamber is hard to guess. It has been variously dubbed a *hêrôn* or *hypogaion* or *thalamos* or cenotaph, but in appearance, size, and location, it is most like the monument of Battus on the east side of the agora of Cyrene: not the original grave mound, which had been willfully destroyed, but an empty stone chamber with gable roof constructed long after, in the later fourth century, as if this was somehow an acceptable substitute.⁸ Both chambers are a solid, indestructible *oikos*, and at Paestum the contents sealed inside might be taken as emblematic household stores.⁹ Perhaps this is another way, besides a founder's tomb, to symbolize and perpetuate the founding of the city.

Curti and van Bremen direct us instead to an installation at Selinus—to the *naiskos* of Zeus *milichios* on the hill *Gaggera*, which had a curious subterranean system beneath its foundations, as described by Gabrici.¹⁰ A stone chamber, 1.60 m $\times$ 1 m, and two upright terracotta cylinders, .70 m and .60 m in diamêter, are covered by slabs of stone with two holes cut through them, opening into the chamber and the larger cylinder and quite suitable for libations. Yet the *naiskos*—at the eastern edge of the area filled with *milichios* stones—is now thought to be no earlier than the fourth century, when Selinus came under Punic control.¹¹ And in our tablet the *Tritopatreis*, whether foul or pure, are quite apart from Zeus *milichios*, whether in [the land] of *Myskos* or in [the land] of *Euthydamos*.

JJK also remark the drastic custom of pouring blood through a hole into the reputed graves of heroes, especially of those regarded as ancestors.¹² With both kinds of *Tritopatreis* the contrasting libations are poured into the sunken chamber, but, unlike blood, neither wine nor honey-mix is distinctive of heroes.¹³

The direct evidence for the cult of *Tritopatreis* is more enlightening. The cult site on Delos is a triangular paved floor, 20 m $\times$ 10 m, with a low marble cylinder, exterior diamêter 2.20 m, interior 1.60 m, standing at the truncated apex.¹⁴ The cylinder, a massive wall and curb, has an opening cut through on one side, a doorway as it were, and opposite the opening is, or was at the time of excavation, a basin roughly formed of rough-hewn stones, doubtless for offerings. Beneath the floor of the cylinder was a deep layer of earlier sacrificial debris. The cylinder was always open at the top, without a cap, for the

inner face of the curb above the basin is inscribed. The side opening was evidently used for the deposit of offerings because one refrained from leaning over the top. A smaller cylinder some way off was similarly used for “Nymphs”; there is no offering basin, however.¹⁵ Perhaps the offerings to the Nymphs did not include the same solid matter, but only libations.

The cult site at Athens, outside the Sacred Gate, has a similar shape, 31 m $\times$ 16 m, and much sacrificial debris, though no reported traces of any installation.¹⁶ At Marathon one of those two entries in the month *Skiophorion* consists of two items: “φρέατος of the well, 6 drachmas, for *Tritopatreis* a table, 1 drachma” (*IG* 2² 1358 A col. 2 lines 52–53).¹⁷ Such a fixture as on Delos might be called a “well,” and a table might be set up nearby in the same precinct. If we are to imagine at all the fixture and precinct of the *Tritopatreis* at Selinus, these instances on Delos and at Athens and Marathon must guide us.

The Two Modes of Sacrifice

The phrases “just as to the heroes” and “just as to the gods” prominently used at the beginning and the end of the rules for the *Tritopatreis* emphasize the different modes of sacrifice for foul and pure, respectively. The offerings are different, and more importantly they are presented in different ways.

For the foul *Tritopatreis* libation is of wine, rich and potent; for the pure it is of dulcet honey-mix, which as we saw works also on the *Semnai Theai*. For the foul the animal victim is left unspecified; for the pure it is a full-grown animal and of the “ancestral” kind, a full-grown sheep or pig or whatever.¹⁸ When the choice is left open, a younger animal, less costly, will be preferred. The younger animal that is often preferred, the least costly of all, is a *choiros* “porker.” Hereafter in the tablet, when Zeus *milichios* is honored at home and not at his sanctuary, a wider choice of victim is allowed, “whatever the ancestral customs allow” (line 22). It was on such an occasion—sacrificing to the same god at the same season according to a general custom—that Xenophon in a pinch chose to offer porkers ([chapter 12](#), pp. 193–94).

For the *Tritopatreis*, the range of allowable victims is illustrated at Erchia and Marathon. A full-grown sheep is offered to the *Tritopatreis* at Erchia and in one case at Marathon.¹⁹ At Marathon the offering “at the well” costs “6 drachmas,” the only such amount in the calendar.²⁰ It very likely represents two porkers since they always cost “3 drachmas,” and another time three of them are sacrificed together, with “9 drachmas” as the total cost.²¹

The offerings for both foul and pure are in one respect presented

in just the same way. They are burnt up entirely, *καταγιζόντο* and *κατακαίντο* (lines 12, 16), and the burnt remains go into the chamber or pit and are solidified by the operation of moistening and smearing, discussed below. For the foul *Tritopatreis* all this is done by *οἷς ὀσία* “those who have the right,” a priestly family; not, however, for the pure *Tritopatreis*, so far as the tablet indicates.²² The priestly family will expect a share of that lesser victim as their perquisite. The larger victim belongs to the worshippers alone, a fortunate provision.

Both foul and pure *Tritopatreis* require this form of sacrifice by their nature, as dwellers beneath the earth. But the pure *Tritopatreis* emerge for a while to enjoy the very different rite of table hospitality, *theoxenia*.²³ Table and couch are set up, and a variety of table offerings are placed on a clean cloth. During the same interval, we must suppose, the worshippers feast nearby on the rest of the meat. When the offerings are gathered up from the table afterwards, and burnt and deposited in the chamber, this is an unusual step in the context of *theoxenia*.²⁴ The *Tritopatreis* are again thought of as dwelling beneath the earth, as accessible through the chamber.

A “Ninth” Portion

The directions for sacrificing to the foul *Tritopatreis* identify the portion of the victim that is to be burnt up as an offering. The same portion, if not the same victim, is presupposed for the pure *Tritopatreis*, since nothing else is said. After the libation of wine, “of the portions that are *ἐνάται* ninths, burn up one.” The language here is welcome as an instructive variation of three epigraphic instances of the verb *ἐνατεύω*. A yearling “is ninthed” for Semele on Myconos (*LSCG* 96.23–24); the victim “is *not* ninthed” for Heracles *Thasios* (*LSSuppl.* 63.4–5); in a fragmentary lease of “the Garden of Heracles” on Thasos an ox is mentioned, and thereafter it or something else “(shall / shall not) be ninthed” (*IG* 12 *Suppl.* 353.9–10).²⁶ As P. Stengel first argued, the verb means in effect “burn up a ninth (of).”

What are “ninth portions”? The only logical inference, drawn by Stengel and by others since, is that the animal was butchered so as to produce nine ostensibly equal parts.²⁷ Logic however is not a sure guide to religious practice. And it should be obvious that the practice of burning up a ninth portion was dictated not by logic—not by any standard practicable way of butchering an animal—but by the magic number nine.²⁸ Though Eumaeus in the *Odyssey* divides a sacrificial victim into seven equal parts, and Hermes in his Homeric *Hymn* divides two of them into twelve equal parts, these feats are not realistic.²⁹

Thus understood, as magical pretence, the practice only requires that some part or other of the animal be plausibly identified as a ninth portion. And then it can only be a front thigh, the customary part for burning up.³⁰ We shall further reflect that it would be very odd indeed if some or any ninth portion of the animal other than a front thigh came to have the same use.³¹ The partitive genitive *τῶν μοιρῶν τῶν ἐνάταν* “of the portions that are ninths” need not denote nine large joints or nine assembled packages. Both front thighs are burnt up in the cult of Heracles at Sicyon, says Pausanias, speaking of *οἱ μῆροί*, plural (2.10.1). The stricter observance is not for Selinus. Of the “ninths,” plural—i.e. of the two front thighs—only one is burnt up.

Sprinkling and Smearing

At the sacrifice to the foul *Tritopatreis* “those who have the right,” the priestly family, burn up the thigh. Since there is no altar, they will use a hearth or brazier. Then they place the charred bone and ashes in the chamber or pit. Finally, *περιράναντες καταλινάντο* (lines 12-13). At the sacrifice to the pure *Tritopatreis*, where the priestly family are not mentioned, the procedure is more briefly indicated: “they shall burn up and *καταλινάντο* the same form of the same verb (line 16). No doubt the concomitant *περιράναντες* is taken for granted. Of the two actions, *peripraîneiv* *περιπραίνειν*, does not. It is rendered “anoint” by JJK and everyone since, but such a meaning is not authorized. *(κατ)αλίνειν*, *(κατ)αλῖναι* are otherwise known only as glosses and as synonyms of *(κατ)αλείφειν* *(κατ)αλεῖψαι*. Whereas the simple verb *ἀλείφειν* is used of anointing the body with oil, the compound means rather “smear (over),” “plaster (over).” *ἀλείφειν* is used of plastering fences, roofs, and the like as a workaday operation (*LSJs.v.*). Here it is a ritual smearing.

JJK think of “sprinkling round” and of “anointing” as two holy acts.³² The place or the persons are sprinkled, perhaps with water, perhaps by circling round, perhaps to purify them. As the object of anointing, perhaps with oil, they propose either an altar, to be deduced from the ritual of the pure *Tritopatreis*, or a sacred stone, or something “iconic” or “aniconic,” as in the worship of Zeus *milichios*.³³ Such holy acts of sprinkling and anointing are very common and very diverse, as JJK indicate. But they are not suggested by the language and the context of the tablet.

The two acts are expressed as participle and verb, *περιράναντες*. Holy or magic acts that are each of them distinct are elsewhere expressed by a series of coordinate verbs (B 5-7) or by two coordinate

infinitives (B 4) or two coordinate participles (B 11). On the other hand, participle and verb are naturally taken as a single operation. So they are twice otherwise, in the ritual of the pure *Tritopatreis*:

καπαρξάμενοι κατακαάντο, καταλινάντο...ἐνθέντες (lines 15-16). Surely our two acts are a single operation, the treatment of the burnt remains that have just been mentioned. Lying now on the floor of the chamber or pit, they are moistened with water and then smeared over the floor to make a smooth, gluey coat.

The ashes of any sacrifice are sacred and are not removed but left in place by whatever means.³⁴ The fireplace on an altar top is a receptacle in which ashes may accumulate.³⁵ Altars may be surrounded by ashes, sometimes in deep layers, sometimes extending far off. The huge altar of Zeus at Olympia was formed entirely of the cemented ash of thighs. Recent ash was kept apart in the Prytaneion until, each year in early spring, it was kneaded with water from the freshly flowing Alpheius and plastered on as a new coat, an operation somewhat similar to ours (Paus. 5.13.8-11, cf. Plut. *De def. or.* 41, 433B-C, schol. Pind. *Ol.* 11.58).³⁶ It is true that sanctuary regulations prohibit the dumping of ash.³⁷ But this is doubtless the ash of ordinary fires lit elsewhere.

The operation that is here prescribed, of creating a coat of ash on the floor of an enclosed chamber, is proper to *Tritopatreis*—perhaps it follows from their nature as wind gods and greedy eaters ([chapter 11](#)). On Delos, as we saw, the circular chamber belonging to *Tritopator*, though not the one belonging to the Nymphs, has a basin within that may serve to collect the ash. At Cyrene a hollow circular altar has lately been discovered in the agora, with a perforated wall that allows liquid to drain off while confining the solid ash sediment securely. It may well belong to *Akamantes*, deities related to *Tritopatreis* ([chapter 19](#), pp. 294-95). As the converse of this practice, Cyrene requires the solidified residue of an improper sacrifice—a wrong victim offered by a lay person to either *Tritopatreis* or *Akamantes*—to be laboriously scraped and scrubbed off the altar ([chapter 19](#), pp. 296-97).³⁸

“Just as to the Heroes,” “Just as to the Gods”

In phrases unparalleled in any other document, the tablet calls for sacrifice as appropriate to divine powers of two general categories (A 10, 17, B 12-13). The phrases *ὡςπερ τοῖς ἡρώεσι* “just as to the heroes” (line 10) and *ὡςπερ τοῖς θεοῖς* “just as to the gods” (line 17) are coordinate, referring to sacrifice to *Tritopatreis* foul and pure, respectively.³⁹ Whereas the first phrase introduces the one form of sacrifice, the second phrase looks back to the other form. Thus situated at the beginning and the end of the whole section, they

emphasize the contrast between the two forms.⁴⁰ In column B the single phrase *ὡςπερ τοῖς ἀθανάτοισι* “just as to the immortals” functions differently. As we shall see, it serves to describe the form of sacrifice appropriate to the *elasteros*, together with the following clause, “but one shall slay the animal with the blood running down to earth.” The *elasteros* is a power that belongs at once to the sky, the realm of the Olympians alias “the immortals,” and to the under-earth. He is worshipped accordingly.

With the *Tritopatreis*, the forms of sacrifice are contrasting in that the portion of the victim offered to the foul ones is at once burnt up and deposited in the chamber, whereas the portion offered to the pure ones is set out for a time on a table, probably for the time it takes the worshippers to enjoy a meal nearby, and only then is burnt up and deposited in the chamber. Thus the foul *Tritopatreis* are thought of as dwelling beneath the earth and not emerging at all; probably the worshippers wished it so and tried to make it so. The pure *Tritopatreis* are thought of as emerging for a while and enjoying human company and then returning in due time to their home below; probably it was likewise the desired effect.

If this is to offer sacrifice “just as to the heroes” and “just as to the gods,” then heroes are thought of as dwelling beneath the earth exclusively, and gods are thought of as dwelling in both realms, beneath the earth and above it or else everywhere. Greek gods are indeed so thought of; the idea belongs to the definition of a nature religion, of “polytheism.” But it is not usual at all to think of Greek heroes, especially those of cult, as a class restricted to under-earth.

The very rite of *theoxenia* that distinguishes the pure *Tritopatreis*, and brings them into festive company with the worshippers, is more often accorded to heroes—notably to Heracles, who was as popular at Selinus as at other cities in the west.⁴¹ In general, the power of heroes, and hence their abode, is varied; certain heroes are commonly recognized as minor or “faded” gods of diverse kinds.⁴² Of Heracles alone it is said that he is worshipped now “as a hero,” now “as a god.” As others have observed, it is a consequence of the story that he alone among heroes was taken up to Olympus after death—ingenuity must discover contrasting rites. Pausanias describes such a contrast at Sicyon between dining on the meat and burning it (2.10.1).⁴³ It is quite unsuited to the present case.

In the tablet the respective rites are fully prescribed for their own sake. They are only commended, as an afterthought, by the phrases “just as to the heroes” and “just as to the gods.” We require a class of heroes who are precisely powers of under-earth. As we saw ([chapter 6](#), p. 95), such a class is an old belief, formerly widespread: the mighty dead dwelling underground in their uncounted graves in a dark realm.

Hesiod drew a picture of the golden and silver races with corresponding detail. The silver race are the heroes of old belief, labeled as they should be *hypochthonioi* “under-earth,” whereas the golden race are strange beings strangely labeled *epichthonioi* “above-earth,” otherwise unheard of. The old belief remained strong in the west, where local heroes are mostly wanting. Cyrene worships the *Heroes*, like Zeus *milichios*, at the niches and altars of Ain Hofra. Selinus exalts them for the sake of contrast, rather like Hesiod.

1. According to JJK 29–30, 34, 67–73, 111–12, followed by Georgoudi (2001), these “ancestral spirits” are made foul or pure by the actions of their worshippers, by homicide pollution or by purifying rites. Clinton (1996, 170–72) thinks of two groups of “collective ancestors,” but perhaps in adjacent precincts—for they are served by the same altar (as to Clinton’s view of the sacrificial procedure see note 33). Lupu (2005, 372) rehearses both interpretations impartially.

2. The expressive custom of libation is summarized by JJK 30, 72–72. It might be added, after Jameson elsewhere (1965, 164–65), that in the calendar of Erchia the sacrifice to Zeus *milichios* is uniquely described as

νηφάλιος μέχρι σπλάγχχνων “with no wine until the organs” (Daux [1963] = SEG 21.541, A 41–43). Wine was excluded at the outset, in the libation preliminary to sacrifice, which was perhaps of honey-mix. But when the organs were roasted and ready to eat, there was another libation, more robust.

3. The usual word is *σπένδω* compounds include *κατασπένδω*, but not with such a meaning as here.

4. JJK 32, 34, 69, Clinton (1996, 171–72), Lupu (2005, 371, 374–75).

5. JJK 69–70, Clinton (1996, 171–72), and Lupu (2005, 377) all recognize a difficulty with the cups. “If [the cups] are to be put in the fire,” say JJK, “the order of procedure is strange. One would expect the cups to have been anointed first.” They accordingly suggest that the cups go into the chamber like the libations but perhaps through “some other opening.” In the same breath, it seems, comes the instruction to anoint the altar. Clinton proposes two alternative punctuations that are not less difficult.

6. JJK 30–31. Paestum’s chamber: Kron (1971), Greco in Theodorescu and Greco (1983, 28–33).

7. Rausch (2000b, 111–16). Rausch says of the expression *ta hiara ta damosia* inline 18 that it denotes “official property” and indicates that the cult of *Tritopatreis* has an “official character.” It refers rather to the table and table service provided in the shrine of Zeus *milichios* (chapter 1, pp. 23–24; chapter 12, p. 188).

8. See chapter 19, pp. 292–93. The monument of Battus is adduced by Rausch (2000b, 108), after Greco.

9. The excavated contents were eight bronze-sheathed jars full of honey, a black-figure amphora, five iron spits, a bed, and an olpe inscribed *ras vúas*

ταῖς νύμφας ἐμὶ ἡια[ρόν] (SEG 35.1035, c. 530–520 b.c.): ideal stores and furnishings and an ideal matrimonial alliance?

10. Curti and van Bremen (1999, 29–30).

11. The building history is obscure and controversial, but no definite evidence of the Greek period has ever been produced: JJK 133–34. On the other hand, the area of the *milichios* stones shows a near-perfect continuity of worship: chapter 12, pp. 189–92.

12. JJK 31, 71, followed closely by Lupu (2005, 372–73).

13. On the offering of blood to heroes see Robertson (1992, 244–45, 248–49).

14. Roussel (1929, 167–71, 177–78), *Délos* 211–12. The paved floor goes with later use, when the ground had risen halfway up the cylinder.

15. See chapter 11, p. 171. Roussel (1929, 174–76) surveys four circular altars—at Didyma, Agragas, in the *Kabeirion* of Delos, at the grotto on Cynthus—without finding much resemblance. (Another, in the agora of Cyrene, has just emerged, and Santucci [1998, 527, 529–30] cites further parallels.) “The monuments of the *Pyrrhakidai* are at once altar and sacred enclosure,” says Roussel. (He does not think of the triangular area as a precinct.) “Despite the opening which has been provided, they recall the *abata* found on Delos, especially the semi-circular *abaton* situated to the north of the Stoa of Antigonos. But there one offered sacrifice; in the monument of *Tritopator*, the quadrangular basin, made of hewn stones, must have constituted the *eschara* or the *bothros* proper, devoted to a chthonian cult.”

16. Ohly (1965, 327–28), Knigge (1974, 187–88, 191–92; 1988, 103–5).

17. Lambert (2000a) reedits the inscription with many small improvements.

18. JJK 31 wrongly suppose that the foul *Tritopatreis* “do not receive avictim of their own,” only parts from the two victims offered to Zeus *eumenes* and the *Eumenides* and to Zeus *milichios* in the land of *Myskos*, respectively. As we have seen, those victims belong to quite different occasions. Parker (2005a, 43) likewise dissents, raising other objections.

19. Daux (1963, 606–10 Δ 41–46) (Erchia), *IG* 2² 1358 A col. 2 line 32 (Marathon).

20. This is the only preserved entry in which no animal is named beside the cost, but there is no reason to think it other than a sacrifice; the very amount serves to indicate two porkers as sacrificial victims.

21. *IG* 2² 1458 A col. 1 line 55, col. 2 lines 4, 14 (as restored), 21 (as restored), 28, 31, 36, 37, 42, 44 (three such to *Eleusinia* and *Koree*).

22. Surprisingly, οἷς ὁσία has received little comment. JJK 19, cf. 32, speak of “those to whom it is ritually permitted,” Clinton (1996, 171) of “those who officiate” (he thinks this a civic cult); Lupu (2005, 374) contrasts them with professional help like butchers.

23. Cf. Jameson (1994, 43).

24. As a rule nothing further was done with table offerings; they were no doubt disposed of in a practical fashion by being consumed without ado. “For the most part the Greeks did not continue the drama after the act of consecration,” says Jameson (1994, 37–38), i.e. after the offerings were displayed on the table.

25. It is remarked by JJK 31–32, Clinton (1996, 170–71), Scullion (2000, 164–67), Ekroth (2002, 220–23), Bergquist (2005, 61–62, 64, 68), Henrichs (2005, 54), Lupu (2005, 373–74), Parker (2005a, 43).

26. Ekroth (2002, 257) adduces the “nine *sarkes*” awarded to the priest of Heracles in the arbitration of the Salaminian *genos* (*LS Suppl.* 19, reedited by Lambert [1997]), line 33. These are merely servings of meat, awarded elsewhere in various numbers. Here they correspond (though it has not been remarked) to the nine victims sacrificed in Heracles’ festival at *Porthmos* (lines 85–87).

ἐννέ-/α (σάρκες), restored by Sokolowski with much else at *IG* 2² 1359 / *LSCG* 29 lines 3–4, is only a bare possibility that would have no particular significance.

27. Bergquist (2005), who formerly took a different view, has recanted.

28. At a regular banquet sacrifice the edible meat was cut up at once into individual portions, sometimes into many small portions of equal value or weight, as expressed in minas and obols. See Durand (1979, 150–55), Berthiaume (1982, 48–

53), Linders (1994, 74–75), Leguilloux (1999, 450–51).

29. Eumaeus—“for he knew in his heart what was fair”—carved the roast meat into seven portions and gave one to Hermes and the Nymphs (ἱαν, cf. μίαν) and the other six to the assembled company (Od. 14.432–36). His sevenfold division is cited by Stengel (1910, 132) and by others since and now by JJK 32 and Scullion (2000, 164n6) as the just comparandum. Eumaeus’ whole procedure is of course much debated, but we need not wait for general agreement before affirming that this step does not correspond to ἐνατεύω. He and others previously butchered the animal (425–27) and selected portions “from all the limbs” and burnt them up in the fire (427–29), then cut the rest up small and roasted it and laid it on platters and carved it (430–32), all this somewhat as in epic formulas elsewhere (Kadletz [1984] and Petropoulou [1987] consider Eumaeus’ procedure in the light of such formulas and show that it is unique, not least by disagreeing on what it is). The sevenfold division is a final flourish, an exquisite courtesy. Jameson (1994, 38) states that the seventh portion “is given to Hermes and the Nymphs by being burnt in the fire.” This is in no way indicated, and other destinations are assumed or argued by both Kadletz and Petropoulou (both mentioned by Jameson in passing). Scullion with some hesitation points to *H. Hom. Merc.* 128, where Hermes, after kindling fire and butchering two oxen, divides the meat into “twelve portions,” with a shaking of lots. Can this be anything but a boastful *aition* of sacrifice to the twelve Olympians, whom the merry babe has newly joined? Stengel also compares the extensive distribution of meat at Magnesia’s festival of Zeus *sosipolis* (LSAM 32.54–59), but to little purpose since no portions are specified, nor are they during sacrifice at this altar or that (46–53).

30. The material surveyed by Puttkammer (1910, 16–27) could now be greatly increased.

31. “The burning of a whole thigh... is a comparable procedure,” says Scullion (2000, 164). If *any* ninth portion could be burnt up, a mandatory thigh would be a contrasting procedure. But Ekroth (2002, 332n8r) approaches our result by a different train of reasoning: since “the meat of the back leg of a modern sheep” constitutes about “one-tenth” or “one-sixth” of the total weight according as the bones are removed or not, “the burning of the thigh may not have constituted a substantial difference from the *enateuein* sacrifices.”

32. JJK 33–35, 74; so too Jameson (1994, 43). Parker (1995b, 299) treats it as a “funerary rite” like the anointing of a grave stele.

33. It is for the *astynomoi* to περιaleῖψαι “plaster” the altars in the shrine of Aphrodite *pandemos* (IG 2² 659.24–25) and for the Eleusinian *epistatai* to περιaleῖψαι the altar of Pluto (IG 1³ 356.155, IG 2² 1672.140), all cited by JJK 33 or Clinton (1996, 171). According to Clinton, such passages show—with my emphasis—that “the altar needs to be renewed for the new set of sacrifices that are to be made to the pure Tritopatores, and this renewal is carried out (*after the remains of the preceding sacrifice are removed of course*) by sprinkling the altar with water and anointing it.” To remove the remains, scil. the ashes, would be extraordinary and would need to be postulated for the pure *Tritopatres* as well, in view of the parallel καταλινάντο.

34. Nilsson (1955, 86–88); cf. Ekroth (2002, 47–58, 53–57).

35. Such is the altar of Demeter *malophoros* on Gaggera, and such the altar of Temple E, conventionally assigned to Hera: Nilsson (1955, 88n2).

36. Pausanias himself and Frazer *ad loc.* mention other instances, and Eitrem (1920, 8–9) cites an eighth-century ordinal for the rule that salt and water be consecrated and mixed with ashes and wine, then smeared on the altar and on the walls of a church inside and out. The practice arises from a natural occurrence:

incinerated bone will turn to glue when it is rained on or otherwise mixed with water.

37. The dumping of both *kopros* “dung” and *spodos* “ash” is forbidden at Epidauros (*LS Suppl.* 24 lines 8–9, second century b.c.) and in the sanctuaries of Dionysus and of Leto on Delos (*LS Suppl.* 53 lines 5–9, c. 200 b.c.). Nemeth (1994, 62) is plainly wrong to think of this as a cleansing of altars.

38. The language of scraping and scrubbing is a forthright as that of sprinkling and smearing.

39. On a rival view, to be rejected, the latter phrase goes with the sacrifice that follows, to Zeus *milichios*: [chapter 1](#), p. 22.

40. The contrasting phrases were but briefly noted by JJK 29, 36, and again by Clinton (1996, 171). More recently they have been singled out as bearing on the much discussed contrast between “chthonian” and “Olympian” gods: Scullion (2000), Ekroth (2002, 210n377, 235–38), A. Hermay and M. Leguilloux, *Thes CRA* 1 (2004) 62 s. Sacrifices, Henrichs (2005, 53–55), Parker (2005a, 32–33, 42–43).

41. On the rite of *theoxenia* as addressed to heroes, especially Heracles, see Jameson (1994 *passim*). The cult of Heracles is well attested at Selinus, not to speak of his popularity in sculptured scenes. Early settlers from Selinus established a shrine at the northern edge of the city’s territory, between Segesta and Entella: Piraino 1959 = *SEG* 19.615, c. 600–550 B.C., with recent comment by De Angelis (2003, 153–54, 171). Heracles is named third, after Zeus and *Phobos*, in the victory proclamation of Temple G: Meiggs and Lewis, *GEI* 38 = *SEG* 34.970, here “475–450 B.C.” Temple M on *Gaggera*, 26 m x 11 m, c. 570–560 B.C., has been claimed for Heracles: Pompeo (1999). Likewise, but much more doubtfully, the splendid temple C on the acropolis, 71 m. x 27 m., mid-sixth century: D. Asheri, *CAE*² 4 (1988), 755. It is sometimes suggested that Heracles at Selinus as elsewhere in the west is only a Hellenized Melqart, but influence more likely flowed the other way.

42. Nock (1944) is the classic demonstration of the full range of hero cults, with emphasis on the customs common to gods and heroes. Ekroth (2002) now provides a thorough analysis of all the literary and epigraphic evidence for sacrifice to heroes.

43. As to the language see [chapter 12](#), note 34. The contrast reputedly arose when Phaestus son of Heracles insisted on his father’s due as a god. This person will be a late creation (cf. 2.6.6–7), but the contrast may have been spoken of much earlier.

Tritopatreis as Wind Gods

Synopsis

The nature of *Tritopatreis* is revealed by several kinds of evidence—literature, documents, and excavated shrines. This order of mention ought to be in descending order of importance, but for a long time literature stood alone and proved misleading. Let us reverse the order.

As to archaeology and inscriptions, *Tritopatreis* first appear at Athens at a prominently situated public shrine, well maintained from the late sixth to the late fourth century, then given up. The same cult probably appears in an early Acropolis calendar belonging to some eminent priestly clan and again in the comprehensive civic calendar of c. 400 B.c. Athens has three later and lesser cults as well, two of them belonging to lesser priestly clans. Later cults are also found outside of Athens in an ever-widening periphery—in the Attic demes of Erchia and Marathon's Tetrapolis, on Delos right next to Apollo's sanctuary, at Troezen, and much farther off at Selinus and Cyrene. Those of Delos, Selinus, and Cyrene also belong to priestly clans. The limited evidence for the type of shrine agrees with what we saw at Selinus, a sunken chamber instead of an altar. And the seasonal context agrees with the order of offerings in the tablet, late spring and early summer; some vivid minor deities who promote the crops appear close by. In Athenian and Attic calendars *Tritopatreis* appear in the company of undoubted agrarian deities; the shrines are often found in agricultural areas.

As to literature, *Tritopatreis* were taken up by the Attic chroniclers and by a theogonic poem that might be an Orphic production referring to Attic cult. These works do not survive, however; they are only cited in later lexicons, produced at a time when the worship of *Tritopatreis* had altogether lapsed. The lexicons impose what they take to be the etymological meaning of "ancestors." But the citations give a different picture. *Tritopatreis* are said quite plainly to be "winds." They are invoked before marriage for their fertilizing power. In mythical

guise they are begotten by earth and sun, just as winds are produced by earth and sun in Aristotle. The theogonic poem equates them with Hesiod's Hundred-handers, the primordial winds who blow down the Titans and confine them beneath the bronze doors of Tartarus, a virtual cult site.

In this whole range of evidence, there is almost nothing to show why winds should be called *Tritopatreis* "Having-third-fathers." As was said, the grammarians who debate the etymology came long after the cult had been abandoned; they only improvise. In Hesiod, however, the leading Hundred-hander is made a son-in-law of the new Olympian order, and we recall that in the crisis of Artemisium Athens invoked Boreas as a son-in-law. It seems that local wind gods were typically invoked as sons-in-law of the community that relied on them. Attic Greek for historical reasons lacks the regular word for "son-in-law"; it substitutes *Tritopatreis* "Having-second-fathers" (by inclusive reckoning), i.e. having local fathers-in-law.

Old Theories and New Evidence

This group of deities so strangely named were once known solely from ancient lexicons that offer several citations of prose and poetry. One of these, an Orphic poem describing them as warders of the winds, was interpreted by C. A. Lobeck as showing that they were more truly deified ancestors.¹ Long after, E. Rohde adduced this interpretation like so much else to illustrate a general worship of ancestors.² Around the same time, an actual cult of *Tritopatreis* came to light archaeologically among Archaic and later graves outside the Sacred Gate at Athens. The identity of *Tritopatreis* was now fixed in the minds of classical scholars, to be asserted for the next sixscore years in every publication that mentions them. It has only been reinforced by the Selinus tablet and its supplication of foul and pure *Tritopatreis*. JJK define *Tritopatreis* as "the collective ancestors of a family or group," a definition endorsed by many and disputed by none.³

The question must be reopened. Today, many cults of *Tritopatreis* are known firsthand from inscriptions, and two from excavation, and there is no association with graves. Shrines are sited for convenience, as outside a city gate, and the worship belongs to late spring and early summer, and if other deities are mentioned, they are clearly agrarian. Properly understood, the citations of prose and poetry point in the same direction. The name *Tritopatreis* is curious by any reckoning, and goes with stories about a special relationship between the wind and the community.

Cults of *Tritopatreis* show a very limited distribution and a very limited time span.⁴ Athens has the precinct outside the Sacred Gate (going back to the late sixth century), two other shrines belonging to professed kinship groups (early fourth century, fourth century), an entry in a calendar pertaining perhaps to a well-known *genos* ("470–450 B.c."), and another in the civic calendar of c. 400 b.c. Erchia and Marathon also have their calendar entries (both toward the middle of the fourth century). On Delos the shrine outside the precinct of Apollo belongs to a professed kinship group from the Attic deme *Aigilia* ("400 B.c."). Elsewhere, there is only a boundary marker at Troezen (fourth century); a mention of *Tritopatreis* in Cyrene's rules of sacrifice (late fourth century); and Selinus. Unless this range of evidence is altogether misleading, the cult originates in Athens and perhaps Attica and is soon carried abroad through Athenian influence.⁵ Literary sources, admittedly Athenocentric, likewise treat the cult as Athenian.

The precinct outside the Sacred Gate occupies a very prominent position in the angle between the Sacred Way to Eleusis and the Street of the Tombs.⁶ At the east, the truncated apex of the triangular shape was marked by a boundary stone inscribed "boundary of the shrine of *Tritopatreis*: a place not to be trodden" (IG 1³¹ 066 C, "445–410 B.c."). At the west—the broad base—a third of the triangle shape was marked off by two more such stones (IG 1³¹066 A-B). At the end of the fifth century or the beginning of the fourth this area was enclosed by a wall, and an earlier inscription "shrine of *Tritopatreis*" was built into the south side (IG 1³¹067, "500–480 B.c."). A sounding of 1971 uncovered two places near the middle of the triangle but extending into the separate area at the base, where burnt offerings had been made, and were subsequently—before the wall was built—covered by clay layers in a time of flooding and neglect.⁷ As already said, there is no suggestion here of separate quarters for two kinds of *Tritopatreis*. The burnt offerings are a rite like ours at Selinus, perhaps conducted in turn for both kinds (the two distinct places need not signify, for there were doubtless others). The separate area marked by the boundary stones and afterward protected by the wall was perhaps for the display of table offerings. In the course of time the outer *Kerameikos* came to be the busiest spot in Athens, frequented by prostitutes and hucksters. And so the shrine of *Tritopatreis* was abandoned in the later fourth century and filled over.

It is not unlikely that this early shrine is referred to in the early calendar (IG 1³ 246)—which came to the British Museum "from the Elgin collection" and may well have been posted on the Acropolis. The calendar is a marble block inscribed on all four sides, with

Τριτ-/ [ο]πατρει-/ [ῥσ]ι τεῖ / - - - appearing on what is perhaps the right side (B 15-17). The back, as it may be, records observances in the month *Thargelion*, on “the sixth” and “at the *Plynteria*” (which belongs to the twenty-fifth), followed by others, all lost, in the month *Skiophorion* (C 22-28). The offerings on 6 *Thargelion* include one “to the Hero,” and the sacrifice at the *Plynteria* is “to Athena, a sheep,” and elsewhere, on what is perhaps the left side, there are offerings of wheat “to the pair of Heroes” (D 29-32), and again “to the pair of Heroes in the plain, a mature animal to each” (D 34-39).

As all agree, it is not a civic calendar but one belonging to a lesser association, such as a tribe, phratry, or *genos*. Yet the festival *Plynteria* here mentioned is the civic instance, celebrated on the Acropolis, not any like-named festival in the demes, for only the civic instance was celebrated in *Thargelion* rather than *Skiophorion*.⁸ The obvious choice is a *genos* charged with the Acropolis cult of Athena, either the *Praxiergidai* or the *Eteobutadai*. The latter *genos* also serve *Butes* and (Poseidon) *Erechtheus* and possibly the two *Butadai* ([Hes.] fr. 251), figures who might conceivably be called “the Hero” or “the pair of Heroes” or, if located in the plowland west of Athens and in the deme *Butadai*, “the pair of Heroes in the plain.”⁹ The *Tritopatreis* appear on the narrow side before these entries under *Thargelion* and *Skiophorion*, and so perhaps under the month *Munichion*. On the narrow side after these entries, “the pair of Heroes” and “the pair of Heroes in the plain” are perhaps listed under a continuation of *Skiophorion*. In any case, the *Tritopatreis* of Athens’ calendar are honored at the same season as those of Selinus.

Tritopatreis are now represented by an entry in Athens’ compendious calendar of sacrifice on the Attic-letter side inscribed shortly before 400 B.c. (*Hesperia* 76 [2007] 47-53, Face B lines 16ff.).¹⁰ They receive a victim, lost in a lacuna, worth eight drachmas; the priestly perquisite is relatively high, three drachmas. The date is “the ninth” of a month that does not appear. Before and after them on the same day are entries for *Heracles* and the *Hyakinthides*, respectively; *Heracles* also receives an offering on an earlier day. He is typically honored in spring and summer, which does not help us to decide the very month. The *Hyakinthides*, however, are assignable to *Skiophorion* with virtual certainty. Euripides in *Erechtheus* identifies these Nymphs with the daughters of *Erechtheus* (test. vi b, fr. 370 line 74 Kannicht). The battle between *Erechtheus* of Athens and *Eumolpus* of Eleusis is commemorated by the festival *Skiophoria* of 12 *Skiophorion*. *Erechtheus*’ daughters were sacrificed just before, to be commemorated by the observance in the calendar—on 9 *Skiophorion*. *Tritopatreis* are honored on the same day in a civic cult that may well be the one in the Acropolis calendar.

Erchia honors *Tritopatreis* on 20 *Munichion*, with a sheep and wineless libation and no carrying away (Daux [1963, 606-10 Δ 41-46]). Marathon honors *Tritopatreis* each year in the month *Skirophorion*, “before the *Skira*,” with a sheep (IG 2² 1358 A col. 2 lines 30, 33).¹¹ Every two years in *Skirophorion* “before the *Skira*,” Marathon honors *Tritopatreis* with the seeming sacrifice “of the well” and a “table” (lines 51, 52-53). Together, the entries at Erchia and Marathon span the whole harvest season, late spring and early summer. Both at Erchia and at Marathon *Tritopatreis* seem to be associated with certain heroes, as we shall see hereafter (pp. 172-74 below), comparable to those of the Acropolis calendar and Athens’ civic calendar.

The shrine of *Tritopator* on Delos lies to the south of the southeast corner of Apollo’s precinct, at the intersection of the road running south from the precinct and of others running west and southeast.¹² At the south end of the triangular precinct—the apex—is the cylindrical chamber already mentioned. The inside of the curb is inscribed “*Tritopator* of the *Pyrrhakidai*,” and another genitive “of *Aigilia*” is squeezed in below as an afterthought (*IDelos* 1.66, “400 B.c.”).¹³ The sacrificial debris beneath it, extending also beneath the pavement of the precinct and earlier than both, consists of animal bones, charcoal, and ashes, and goes down to virgin soil. Much farther out on the road running southeast, near the lower reservoir of the Inopus, is the other cylindrical chamber inscribed in the same way, “*Nymphs of the Pyrrhakidai*” (*IDelos* 1.67, likewise “400 B.c.”).¹⁴

Other remains at Athens and again at Troezen are less informative. A boundary stone found on the south bank of the Ilissus is inscribed “boundary of the shrine of *Tritopatreis*,” and another genitive “of the *Zakyadai*” is inscribed transversely below (IG 2² 2615). A boundary stone found at the north foot of the Areopagus is inscribed “boundary of the shrine of *Tritopatreis* of the *Euergidai*” (*Agora* 19 H 20). We are left to wonder whether the one shrine lay on a road outside the agora and the other on a road outside a city gate at the southeast. At Troezen a stele inscribed simply “of the *Tritopatreis*,” assignable to the fourth century, came to light in a later context “near the ancient city.”¹⁵ Possibly then it was on a road outside a gate.

The sacred law of Cyrene of the late fourth century contains a section about the shrines and rites of *Tritopateres* and *Akamantes* (chapter 19). Long misunderstood, it appears to say that everyone is hereby granted access, without let or hindrance by the priestly clans to whom the shrines belong. If a sacrifice is bungled by an unskilled person, the altar is scrupulously cleaned by a procedure that would undo the “smearing” of our tablet. The two rules, at Selinus and Cyrene, converge remarkably. *Akamantes* are known from other

inscriptions of Cyrene, and may well be represented by a recently discovered altar in the agora in the form of a circular stone chamber like those of *Tritopatreis*.

Agrarian Deities Associated with *Tritopatreis*

We should consider also some deities closely associated with *Tritopatreis*. On Delos, Nymphs are worshipped at another cylinder by the same kinship group. They are the water spirits of the nearby Inopus, a seasonal stream that could have no useful effect but in spring. The early calendar at Athens, arguably of the *Eteobutadai*, prescribes sacrifice a little later, in *Thargelion*, to “the Hero” and to Athena at the *Plynteria* and later still to “the pair of Heroes” and “the pair of Heroes in the plain” (IG 1³ 246). The season is harvest time; the offering of wheat to the pair of Heroes is very suitable.

The whole calendar of Marathon, an agricultural area, is focused on agrarian deities (SEG 50.168 / IG 2² 1358). The rubric “before the *Skira*” places *Tritopatreis* and certain other deities in the context of Demêtêr’s harvest festival. In an annual cycle the rubric embraces—at different sites, as shown by the perquisites—*Hytténios* and *Kurotrophos*, *Tritopatreis*, and *Akamantes* (side A col. 2 lines 30–33). In a biennial cycle the rubric embraces *Galios* and *Tritopatreis*, again at different sites (side A col. 2 lines 51–53).

Hytténios, though otherwise unknown, is not disinclined to agriculture; he receives *horaia* offerings “of the season.”¹⁶ *Kurotrophos* is unhelpful, for she appears almost everywhere in the calendar, almost always in second place. *Akamantes* are much more revealing. As was just said, *Tritopateres* and *Akamantes* appear side by side at Cyrene as the proprietary cults of certain clans. The name

Ἀκάμαντες is formed from α (privative) + √καμ(κάμνω); it is the plural of *ἄκάμας* “untiring” (cf. *ἄκάματος* “untiring”), also used as a name, *ἀκομας* “Untiring,” of both heroes and ordinary persons.¹⁷ The meaning “Immortals,” which has been suggested for both Marathon and Cyrene, is most unfortunate.¹⁸ It is based on a secondary meaning of *καμώντες*, i.e. “dead”, and contradicts the normal use of the words and contradicts as well the nature of heroes such as it supposedly describes, for they are precisely the mighty dead. The true meaning of *Akamantes* is “Untiring” ones, and the only group of powers likely to be so called are the winds.¹⁹ *Notos* and *Boreas*, the opposing winds that churn the sea, are called *ἄκάμας* by Sophocles (*Trach.* 112–13), and all winds are called *ἄκάματοι* by Empedocles in the lines promising magic power to an adept, including power to still or to raise the winds (*VorSokr* 31 B 111.3–5). Winds are

all-important at harvest time. For Γολιός as the other companion deity, we are led to $\sqrt{\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha/\gamma\epsilon\lambda\alpha/\gamma\lambda\alpha}$ meaning “still” or “bright.”²⁰ Bright skies and still weather are all-important at harvest time.

At Erchia *Tritopatreis* are honored on 20 *Munichion* with a sheep, libation not of wine, and no carrying away, and on 21 *Munichion* *Leukaspis* too is honored just so (Daux 1963, 606–10 Δ 41–46, Γ 48–53). These two observances on successive days are likely to be related. Here is another transparent name: “White-shield.” *Leukaspis* happens to be also a Sican hero of Sicily, one of six heroes worshipped ever since they were killed by Heracles (Diod. 4.23.5). The names are given in two groups, four transparent Greek names (*Leukaspis*, *Pediakrates*, *Buphonas*, *Glykatas*) and two others that must be a rendering of Sican names. When we meet *Leukaspis* at Erchia, we should not imagine that a Sican hero was brought to Attica.⁴ Instead, the same name has been given to similar powers in the two places.²¹ In Sicily all the Greek names seem apt for powers invoked at harvest time. At Erchia *Leukaspis* belongs in *Munichion*. As to *Pediakrates*, he is matched both by *Hyperpedios* in *Thargelion* (Daux 1983, 152–54 line 48, calendar of Thoricus) and by the pair of Heroes *em pedioi* in *Skirophorion*, as it seems (IG 1³ 246 D 34–36, Athens’ early calendar). As to *Buphonas*, we cannot but be reminded of the *Buphonia*, Athens’ sacrifice of a plow-ox, on 14 *Skirophorion*.²² As to *Glykatas*, we are left to guess: “sweet” fig pastry is a typical harvest offering (cf. chapter 13, p. 210n43).

Leukaspis has yet another congener. On 16 *Munichion* the *Salaminioi*, one of Athens’ hieratic *gene*, sacrifice to *Eurysakes* “Broad-shield” at their proprietary shrine in Melite (*LSSuppl.* 19.87). *Eurysakes* was held to be a son of Ajax; together with Athena *Skiras* and the hero *Skiros*, he seems to link the *Salaminioi* with the like-named island. The affiliation probably goes back to the time of Cleisthenes, since the tribe *Aiantis* set up decrees at this shrine. But as others have said, it is plainly secondary.²³ At an earlier day this Athenian “Broad-shield” was a functional hero, with a function matching that of “White-shield.” The three heroes, at Erchia and in Sicily and at Athens, are named for some power denoted by their shields. In Greek warfare a hoplite presses on the enemy with his shield, so that a buffeting wind may well be likened to a shield-bearing warrior. The “Hundred-handers” of Hesiod, as we shall see, are named for the pummeling of the winds; they fling rocks against the Titans and overbear them, driving them down to Tartarus. Such images convey the palpable force of strong winds.

At Marathon again, in another series that is perhaps annual, the date 11 or 12 *Skirophorion* is given for a sacrifice to $\Delta\iota\iota\ \omicron\rho\acute{\iota}\omega\iota$ (IG 22

1358 A col. 1 line 11).²⁴ The epithet has always been taken as ὄριος "of the boundary."²⁵ But it can just as well be ἄοριος "of fair winds," for ἄ and ἄν are interchangeable on the stone, as in e.g.

Κοροτρόφωι / Κουροτρόφωι. Erchia, too, let us note by the way, sacrifices to Διο ἄρωι on 16 *Posidêôn* (Daux [1963, 606-10 E 28]), and again οὔριος suggests itself. for ἄ and ἄν are again interchangeable, as in e.g. ἵσταμένο / ἵσταμένον. Winds are likewise of concern at the coldest time of year; a little later, on 9 *GamêLiôn*, Athena is honored at the local citadel with Ἡροσουρίοις "spring wind rites" (B 26-30). It is true that Zeus οὔριος is best known as a god of seafarers.²⁶ But in agricultural communities like Marathon and Erchia he may be invoked for other purposes.

In Athens' civic calendar the entry for *Tritopatreis* is followed on the same day by one for the Nymphs called *Hyakinthides*: these are deities who typify the burgeoning growth of spring. Admittedly, the civic calendar is all-embracing; we cannot be sure that adjacent entries belong together.

General Features of the Cult of Tritopatreis

To sum up, *Tritopatreis* are worshipped with a peculiar rite of placing food offerings—libation, burnt portions, other fare—inside a closely confined cylinder or "well."²⁷ This is plainly said at Selinus; a low or sunken installation is preserved on Delos and is suggested by "the well" at Marathon. On Delos the marble cylinder is massive, and though its denizens may emerge from the top, worshippers approach only through the side opening. At Selinus the offerings themselves are secured within by the operation of smearing over; something similar was done at Cyrene. At Selinus again and perhaps at Marathon with juxtaposed "well" and "table," the pure *Tritopatreis*, but not the foul, also enjoy table offerings beside their worshippers. So the *Tritopatreis*, while usually pent up, also emerge at certain times; it is only that the foul kind are not wanted. This form of worship is perhaps shared by *Akamantes*; as to other congeners, wind gods as a class will be mentioned below.

Tritopatreis belong to a definite season, before and during the harvest. It is the month *Munichion* = April at Erchia and probably at Athens, *Thargelion* = May probably at Athens, *Skiophorion* = June at Marathon, early summer at Cyrene. They are found in the company of several agrarian deities and of *Akamantes* as undoubted wind gods.

Undoubted wind gods, let us observe, are worshipped just like *Tritopatreis*, with ample offerings deposited in *bothroi*, underground installations. As a subject of story they dwell in caves or below the

earth and are notoriously greedy eaters.²⁸

Tritopatreis in the Attic Chroniclers

After the direct evidence of archaeology and inscriptions we come to literary sources, and first the Attic chroniclers. In Harpocration and other lexicons, Phanodemus *FGrH* 325 F 6, Demon *FGrH* 327 F 2, and Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 182 are cited for mention of *Tritopatreis*. Demon, cited first, says only that they are “winds,” asserting plainly what we have studiously inferred. Philochorus and Phanodemus, cited second and third, do not say what sort of gods they are but offer respectively a quasi-mythical origin and a ritual occasion. It is commonly thought that both regard the *Tritopatreis* as deified ancestors, but this does not follow at all. Instead, the more extensive remarks of Philochorus and Phanodemus are meant to illustrate the wind gods that Demon remarked quite simply.

The ritual occasion in Phanodemus is different from any we have encountered. “Only the Athenians sacrifice and pray to them for the begetting of children whenever they are about to marry,” probably a verbatim quotation. The statement might be understood in two ways: *either* only the Athenians worship *Tritopatreis*, having this ceremony and belief, *or* only the Athenians, in worshipping *Tritopatreis*, have this ceremony and belief.²⁹ The latter is far more likely for two reasons. Phanodemus in the later fourth century could not be unaware that *Tritopatreis* had been taken up elsewhere (as at Selinus, before the mid-fifth century), and the occasion is plainly secondary to the well-attested agrarian cults. In either case, it is commonly inferred that the begetting of children will be promoted by deified ancestors. It will be promoted rather by the fertilizing power of winds. This is a worldwide belief, evident at Athens in a local version of the story of the myth of Boreas and Oreithyia, discussed below.

The excerpt from Philochorus needs careful attention. “Philochorus said that the *Tritopatreis* came into being as the first of all things (πάντων γεγονέναι πρώτους). For (he says) the people of old time understood that Ge and Helios, whom they also called Apollo, were the parents of themselves (γονεῖς αὐτῶν) and that offspring of these were third fathers (τοὺς δὲ ἐκ τούτων τρίτους πατέρας).”³¹ Now Philochorus is not proposing a mythical genealogy in the manner of Hesiod, as if Ge and Helios might be Ge and Uranus.³² He thinks philosophically of “earth” and “sun” as two great fructifying powers, as the source of all life. He therefore says that the first thing they produced were winds and that early man, who quite properly regarded earth and sun as the original parents,

reckoned winds as the next ones, speaking of them inclusively as “third.”³³ All life thereafter followed as a matter of generations.

If winds are to be traced to mythical parents rather than to physical causes, these can only be Ge and Helios. Wind gods are thought of as dwelling in the “earth”; actual winds are thought of as arising from the earth, even in learned doctrine. Once they arise from the earth, the “sun” is held responsible for imparting direction and other qualities; this general belief is elaborately worked out by Aristotle so as to account for the entire wind chart (*Meteor.* 2, chapters 4-6, 940a 16-947b 9).³⁴ If winds have parents, they will also have offspring. So Philochorus’ account does not at all imply that the *Tritopatreis* of cult are deified ancestors. It is entirely consonant with Demon’s statement that they are “winds,” as also with Phanodemus’ notice of the prenuptial custom that invokes their fertilizing power. Philochorus is also behind the second of three definitions in Hesychius s. *τριτοπάτορας*, namely *καὶ γενέσεως ἀρχηγούς* “and originators of generation.”³⁵

Other than these Attic chroniclers, the only prose writer cited for mention of *Tritopatreis* is “Aristotle” (Poll. 3.17 = Arist. fr. 415 Rose³). According to Pollux, he “perhaps” used the word *tritopator* in the sense of *propappos* “great-grandfather.”³⁶ If it is truly Aristotle, we cannot know what he said to admit this inference. The context is not of course Athenian society or history in the *Constitution of Athens*, as Rose thought before this work came to light on papyrus. Some other Aristotelian production may be in view: Lobeck thought of the title

περὶ εὐγενείας ā.³⁷ Nauck, however, emended the name to “Aristophanes” of Byzantium and included this in his fr. 9. Whoever the author and whatever his real meaning, Pollux plainly relies on the later discussion of *Tritopatreis* by grammarians.

Harpocration’s entry *Tritopatores* shows further that this name occurred in the fourth-century orators. Perhaps the priestly clans we meet at Athens and on Delos engaged in litigation, like other such clans.³⁸ But no detail is reported from this background.

Tritopatreis in Poetry

The *Tritopatreis* were also taken up in poetry, as we know likewise from Harpocration and other lexicons. In two late sources, an Attic *Exêgêtikon* and an Orphic *Physika*, a group of three *Tritopatreis* are said to be warders of the winds, a mythical task (cf. Aeolus, *Od.* 10.1-76). They have expressive names that differ between the sources. The *Exêgêtikon* calls them *Kottos*, *Briareos*, and *Gyges*, offspring of Uranus and Ge, just as in Hesiod (*FGrH* 352 F 1).³⁹ The Orphic poem calls

them *Amalkeides*, *Protokles*, and *Protokreon* (*Orph.* fr. 802 Bernabé / 318 Kern).⁴⁰ The parents, though unmentioned, may well be Uranus and Ge again, since these are primordial creatures, *Proto-*. If so, we cannot say which version stands behind Hesychius' first definition (s. *Τριτοπάτορας*), "winds born of Uranus and Ge." Now *Kottos*, *Briareos*, and *Gygeês*, the Hundred-handers, have much to do with winds in Hesiod's *Theogony*, as we are about to see; indeed they are warders of a subterranean place full of winds, namely Tartarus. But a poet as early as Hesiod could not have intended to represent the Attic *Tritopatreis*. Instead, a somewhat later poet varied Hesiod's account so as to exalt this Attic cult. Perhaps it was an Orphic poet. Orphic literature turns ritual into myth and at a certain stage makes much of Attic ritual, not only Eleusinian. If so, the *Exegetikon* will draw on this Orphic poem, and the late Orphic poem *Physica* will vary it. There was in any case a poem antecedent to these late sources; it must date to the heyday of the *Tritopatreis*, from the sixth to the fourth century.

We should consider Hesiod's Hundred-handers in the light of this subsequent development (*Theog.* 147-53, 617-28, 639-75, 713-17, 734-35, 815-19). The monstrous threesome are born of Uranus and Ge at the beginning of creation, just like the Cyclopes.⁴¹ They are at first confined to Tartarus by Uranus but emerge to help Zeus against the Titans and as their lasting employment guard the doors to Tartarus. Tartarus is a vast space beneath the earth, filled with shrieking winds (*Theog.* 742-43). The bronze doors that are the only exit were set in place, evidently as a horizontal cap, by Poseidon (732-33, *ἐπέθηκε*); it is Poseidon who confirms the office of the Hundred-handers by making *Briareôs* his son-in-law (817-19).⁴² Poseidon rather than Zeus takes these steps as *gaieochos*, as the deity concerned with earth's stability. (Earthquakes are generally attributed to Poseidon—but are also caused by winds in popular belief.)⁴³ The bronze doors of Tartarus are a virtual cult site of wind gods. Winds in general blow about in Tartarus; the Hundred-handers were formerly among them; now they enjoy the privilege of guarding the exit. We are reminded of foul and pure *Tritopatreis* at Selinus, the former restricted to the sunken chamber, the latter summoned to dine beside it.

The Hundred-handers like the Cyclopes are elemental forces born of Uranus and Ge before any other deities; both forces are suppressed by Uranus but freed by Zeus so that they have a place in the world we know.⁴⁴ Now *Kyklopes* are the lightning, individually named for its three aspects of boom, flash, and strike; the collective name is a compound of *κύκλος* and *-ωψ* that means "wheel-appearing," the same image as Ixion's wheel.⁴⁵ *Hekatoncheiroi* are a comparable force of nature, with another riddling name that is traditional.⁴⁶ Hesiod thus describes their aid against the Titans.⁴⁷ "They flung three

hundred rocks from their strong hands in a great volley and left the Titans in darkness with their missiles; and they dispatched them beneath the wide-wayed earth and bound them in cruel bonds" (*Theog.* 715-18). An account follows of just how deep the Titans are plunged in Tartarus, ending with the doors and the warders. The Hundred-handers then are strong winds that uproot and flatten objects in their path and also darken the sky.

Tritopatreis according to the Grammarians

We have surveyed all the known occurrences of *Tritopatreis* in Greek literature—in the Attic chroniclers, in "Aristotle," in a theogonic poem. Every voice we can distinguish speaks of *Tritopatreis* as winds. Nearly all of them belong to the time when the cult flourished, on the evidence of archaeology and inscriptions. Philochorus in (probably) the first quarter of the third century is the very latest, apart from echoes of the theogonic poem and perhaps "Aristotle." Otherwise, in either the material record or the literary one, there is no sign of *Tritopatreis* after the fourth century. Accordingly, ancient grammarians who debate the origin and sense of *Tritopatreis* do so without any firsthand knowledge of the subject. They rely entirely on etymology—as indeed we might infer from the two alternative meanings they propose, *propappoi* "great-grandfathers" and *propateres* "forefathers."

They cite the name, it is true, in some unexpected forms.⁴⁸ Inscriptions at Athens and elsewhere use only the form *Τριτοπατρεῖς* (the earliest being one of those outside the Sacred Gate, "470-450 b.c."), except for *Τριτοπάτωρ* on Delos and *ἀριτοποτερες* at Cyrene.⁴⁹ Though the lexicons are acquainted with *Τριτοπατρεῖς*, they strongly prefer *Τριτοπάτωρ*.⁵⁰ The discrepancy can be explained.⁵¹ We should be aware that the ending -*τωρ*, -*τορες* came to be somewhat disused in Attic, as an agent ending but also in kinship words.⁵² There is scarcely any example at all in pre-Hellenistic inscriptions unless it is *ρήτωρ*, and inscriptions as well as literature always say *φράτηρ* instead of *φράτωρ*.⁵³ Probably then Athenians at large spoke offhand of *ἀριτοπατῆρας* and gave the lead elsewhere, as at Troezen and Selinus, but the Attic chroniclers insisted rather on *Τριτοπάτωρ* as more correct or more pristine.⁵⁴ Furthermore, the two epigraphic instances of *Τριτοπάτωρ* and *Τριτοπάτωρ* happen to be proprietary cults of priestly families, who may likewise have insisted on the less usual form.

The word *τριτογένεια* is often adduced by modern authorities as apparently similar in meaning.⁵⁵ An alleged "proverb" turns on the word—"may the child be *tritogenes*, not *tritogeneia*" (schol. *Il.* 8.39,

Suda s. *tritogeneia*)— and this has been ingeniously ascribed to the prenuptial prayers reported by Phanodemus.⁵⁶ But the word is otherwise used only as an epithet of Athena, and in the context of her birth from Zeus' head beside a lake or river named *Tritônis* or the like. Both the lake or river and the sea god *Triton* show that *trito-* here means "water"; both Athena's epithet and the story of her birth are matched by Vedic and Avestan *Apam Napat*.⁵⁷ This other word is unrelated.

What then of etymology? The compound *τρίτο-πατρεῖς* has been taken to mean either "third-fathers" or "having-third-fathers" and interpreted respectively as either "great-grandfathers" or "third in the descending line," i.e. "forefathers." Both views are taken by ancient grammarians, and both have modern supporters.⁵⁸ The first meaning would indeed be plainly expressed by the form *τρίτοποτερεο*. Such is the form presented by the inscription of Cyrene (chapter 19). But this is almost the latest occurrence; it is a secondary form and no doubt a misunderstanding. The endings *-ενς* and *-ωρ* suggest the second meaning, "having-third-fathers."⁵⁹ And if the reckoning is inclusive, the meaning is rather "having-second-fathers." In either case, the interpretation "forefathers" is unwarranted. We should also be aware that such a form, called a "determinative compound," is relatively late, being used for coinages like *Αἰνόπαρις* or refinements like *ἀκρόπολις*.⁶⁰ This is an unconventional word for some significant relationship that it remains to decipher.

Boreas and Others as "Sons-in-Law"

It is remarkable that mythical wind gods, the subject of famous stories, are insistently characterized as standing in a certain relationship to others, that of son-in-law. We saw above that in Hesiod's *Theogony*, at the end of the long intermittent episode of the Hundred-handers, *Briareos* becomes the son-in-law of Poseidon. These same Hundred-handers are afterward, in some later poem, equated with *Tritopatreis*. Boreas the north wind, always the principal wind god, is son-in-law of the Athenians, exalted as such in the record of the Persian Wars. The notion cannot go far back and most likely arose at just this time, when a north wind reversed the fortunes of war. In earlier poetry Boreas himself has a son-in-law Phineus, whose homeland and household in the north are beset by conflicting winds. Let us survey these stories briefly, beginning with Boreas as son-in-law of the Athenians, by far the best-documented case.

It was Athenian belief, says Herodotus (7.189), that Boreas was their "son-in-law," and so they sacrificed and prayed to him before

and during the providential storm that wrecked the Persian fleet, and afterwards they set up a shrine beside the Ilissus. The kinship term is of the essence. I quote Herodotus in R. Parker's careful translation, adding my own emphasis. "The story is told that the Athenians invoked Boreas because of a prophecy, since a further oracle had come to them telling them to call on *their son-in-law* as an ally (*τὸν γαμβρὸν ἐπίκουρον καλέσασθαι*). According to Greek tradition Boreas has an Attic wife, Oreithyia the daughter of Erechtheus. The Athenians inferred, the story goes, that *because of this marriage-tie* Boreas was *their son-in-law* (*κατὰ δὲ τὸ κῆδος τοῦτο... σφίσι τὸν Βορῆν γαμβρὸν εἶναι*)."⁶¹ Herodotus echoes what he heard at Athens. But the word *γαμβρός* is his own, or perhaps that of the oracle, being both Ionic and poetic. Athens has no specific word for son-in-law apart from the word *κηδεστής*, denoting any relation by marriage.⁶² We must remember this when we come back to the Attic word *Tritopatreis*.

The oracle may well be a later figment, as Athenians rehearsed this tremendous event. Perhaps the relationship first entered literature in Simonides' elegy *The Sea-battle at Artemisium*. A papyrus scrap newly published refers to the "girl," Oreithyia, and to Calais as issue of the marriage (fr. 3 West²).² Aeschylus' satyr play *Oreithyia* turned on the relationship, if it is rightly conjectured that Boreas raged because his suit was rejected (fr. 281 Radt / 292a-b Mette).⁶³ Attic vases of just this time show him pursuing Oreithyia; he appears on the vases almost as suddenly as he did at Artemisium.⁶⁴

The Athenian experience of 480 B.c. is behind two other reports of Boreas saving whole communities. Thurií, says Aelian (VH 12.61), decreed that Boreas was to be a citizen, with house and land, and Thurií also made offerings each year after a storm destroyed another attacking fleet, that of the tyrant Dionysius. "So the Athenians were not alone in regarding him as *kedestes*."⁶⁶ The event, otherwise unknown, is conjecturally assigned to 379 B.c., when Dionysius attacked Croton with more success.⁶⁷ At Megalopolis Pausanias admires an unusual precinct of Boreas where sacrifice was offered each year, and tells how a storm destroyed the siege engines of Agis of Sparta, just as it destroyed the Persian fleet (8.27.14, 36.6).⁶⁸ The event will belong to Agis' long and important campaign of 331/30 B.c., which ended with his death.⁶⁹

Pausanias does not speak of any kinship between Boreas and Megalopolis, nor does he mention that Athens was most concerned in 480 B.c. Aelian, in asserting kinship between Boreas and Thurií, should not be trusted.⁶⁹ The source, as in some other tales of his about Magna Graecia and about Dionysius, is very likely Timaeus (Ael. VH 12.29 = Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 26c, cf. 4.7 = F 159).⁷⁰

Timaetus had a habit of romancing and could say what he liked of Thurii, then a very dejected place.⁷¹ And Timaetus was writing at Athens, where Boreas is an undoubted son-in-law. It was also not so long after Megalopolis instituted a cult of Boreas which Pausanias thinks of as outstanding.

In the sudden peril of Artemisium, Athens fixed on Boreas as son-in-law because the relationship was familiar from old stories. Boreas himself has a son-in-law in king Phineus of Thrace, though the relationship is unremarked by our sources: Boreas' daughter Cleopatra is wife of Phineus, or at least his first wife. In one of Sophocles' two *Phineus* plays, Phineus had twin sons by Cleopatra and chose to blind or kill them (Soph. frs. 704–5 Radt). In *Tympa- nistai* they are blinded by a stepmother and confined in a "tomb" (fr. 645); blinding and confinement are mentioned also in *Antigone* (lines 970–80).⁷³ It cannot be that the wife Cleopatra and the son-in-law relationship first appeared in the tragedians by way of reflecting the interests of fifth-century Athens.⁷⁴ The story of Phineus goes far back, and Cleopatra will be part of it.

In any version the story is all about winds. Phineus dwells in Thrace, home of Boreas, and is afflicted by the Harpies, stormy or blighting winds that snatch or foul his food until they are chased away through the sky by Zetes and Calais, the freshening winds that are twin sons of Boreas. Phineus now marries their sister Cleopatra and begets his own twin sons. He or another confines them underground with great cruelty (as if they were foul *Tritopa- treis*), an ill-judged effort to preserve the integrity of the food supply against any further threat. Phineus' story was once told for its own sake and only later recast as an adventure of the Argonauts—not unsuitably, since the Golden Fleece as the object of their cosmic voyage is an instrument of weather magic and symbol of agricultural resource. Zetes and Calais, however, are most unlikely Argonauts. Instead, it was natural for them to rescue Phineus, and for Phineus to wed their sister Cleopatra, when all of them were simply at home in Thrace. It is true that Phineus himself, the son-in-law, is not a wind god, but he stands for the effect of various winds upon his imaginary kingdom.⁷⁵ The underground prison, like the bronze doors of Tartarus, is the image of an actual cult site. Here is another old story to set beside Hesiod and his tale of Poseidon and *Briareoês*.

We come back to Hesiod only to observe how emphatic the language is. At the very end of the Hundred-handers' episode,

Βριάρεών γε μὲν ἦν ἔοντα / γαμβρὸν ἐὼν ποίησε
βαρύκτονος Ἐννοσίγαιος,
/ δῶκε δὲ Κυμοπόλειαν ὀπίειν, θυγατέρα ἦν (lines 817–19). "*Briareos*, goodly as he was, the deep-booming Earth-shaker *made*

his own son-in-law, by giving him Cymopoleia *to take in marriage, his own daughter as she was.*" The words in italics insist on the formal marriage relationship; they are quite unlike the usual epic formulas for taking a wife and resorting to the marriage bed. Having posted the three stalwarts at a virtual cult site, Poseidon binds them to it by making one of them his son-in-law. *Briareoês* "Strong" is singled out because his name plainly declares the strength of these winds. Homer too compliments *Briareoês* for his role in the succession story (Il. 1.401-6); it is likely, though not demonstrable, that he knows of him as a son-in-law of Poseidon.⁷⁶

The son-in-law relationship of a wind god is a special application, so to speak, of a general belief. Winds fertilize nature year by year, bringing rain or shine, coolness or warmth, producing flowers and foliage and crops. The fertilizing power of these unseen beings is likened to that of men and animals. Boreas as strongest of the winds covers the splendid mares of Erichthonius "He-of-the-very-earth"; they are creatures much like himself and bear fillies that likewise skim the plain or the sea (Il. 20.221-29, briefly explaining why Troy is famed for horses). The original story of Boreas and Oreithyia also expresses the belief. This female partner, "Rushing-on-the-mountain," resembles the wind and redoubles his power by bearing twins. Oreithyia is an obvious name for the belief but not for an Athenian princess, a daughter of Erechtheus beside other daughters conventionally named. On the chest of Cypselus and in other early representations if correctly identified, Boreas and Oreithyia have nothing to do with Attica. It was doubtless in 480 B.C. that they were both inserted in Athens' royal family.

Conformably with the general belief, each community installs its own wind gods at a local cult site for the sake of the crops. Dwelling at the cult site, fed and cherished by the worshippers, these wind gods are plainly related to the community. As potent males they must be sons-in-law. We may safely infer that *gambros* "son-in-law" was a form of address in each cult. *Tritopa-treis*, another word for a close relationship, is a form of address in cults of other wind gods.

Tritopatreis "Sons-in-Law"

Athens has not the regular word for son-in-law, *gambros*. For a very long time, beginning perhaps in the early Dark Age, Athens and an ever-widening area that became the state of Attica were engaged in a process of unification by means of fictitious kinship groups, *phylai* "tribes" and *phratriai* "brotherhoods." Fictitious kinship superseded the extensive ties of marriage alliance and caused the Athenians to speak indiscriminately of all marriage relations as *κηδεστής* or *συγκληδεστής*.

How then shall they invoke their local wind gods?

From a patriarchal point of view, it is the wife's father, the father-in-law, who constitutes the bond between a wind god and the community. A wind god accordingly has a second father besides his own. It may be relevant as well that the Greeks often counted back through two fathers and no more, the father and the grandfather. On this outlook a wind god has a third father besides two of his own. *Tritopatreis* may be understood either way, as "having-second-fathers" or as "having-third-fathers," but the former way is more immediate and was surely intended when the word was coined.

1. Lobeck (1829, 1.753–73).

2. Rohde (1896, 3–5; 1925, 171, 204III24, 342, 356n45).

3. JJK 56–57, 73, 112–13. Cf. Dubois (1995b, 134), Clinton (1996, 172), Georgoudi (2001, 154), Ekroth (2002, 237), Lupu (2005, 372).

4. Cook (1940, 112–40) and Bourriot (1976, 1135–79) offer the fullest discussions of the *Tritopatreis* embracing the archaeological and epigraphic evidence, but neither was adequate even at the time.

5. Linguistically, says Arena (1999, 50), the form *Τριτοπατρεῦσι* in our tablet confirms the relations otherwise reported between Selinus and Athens.

6. Cf. Travlos (1971, 303, 305).

7. So Knigge (1974); cf. chapter 10, note 16.

8. See Robertson (2004, 130–36).

9. The deme *Butadai* is probably named for the *Eteobutadai*, whose Acropolis priesthoods conduct the *Skirophoria* procession to the plowland. *Butadai* and also *Lakiadai*, which has similar associations, lie on the Sacred Way east of the Cephissus and are joined with several other small demes farther west to make the city *trittys* of *Oineis*. For details see Traill (1986, 133).

10. = Gawlinski (2007). This passage of the calendar is more fully treated in chapter 13, pp. 208–9.

11. = Lambert (2000a), an improved edition.

12. *Delos* 211–12.

13. Roussel (1929, 169–71).

14. Roussel (1929, 171–74, 178–79), Bruneau (1970, 436), *Delos* 221.

15. JJK 110 = *SEG* 46.370.

16. It would be surprising if the ritual name *ὕππηνιος* were not cognate with *ὑψης, ὑέτιος, ὑήτιος* "rainy" as epithets of Zeus. Rain is feared just before the threshing, the business of the *Skira*, and is welcomed afterward. The hero *Skiros* embodies the same fear and the same welcome in the farmland by the Cephissus (chapter 13, pp. 207–8). *Skiros* too doubles as a place name, the very place

where the rain magic is performed. And' *ὕππηνιος* is named, more precisely, for a rainy place, unless the element -ππ- is not the usual one. *Ἑππτός* near Orchomenus "is so called for being rained on by frequent downpours" (Steph. Byz.

s.v.); the Thebans in a victory dedication use the more transparent form *ἡνέτιος* (*SEG* 24.300, Olympia, c. 500 B.C.). It lies in a small plain where rain is shed by Mount Laphystius, itself famous for the rain magic of Zeus *Laphystios*. Etienne and Knoepfler (1976, 156–57, 212–15), while discussing the name *Hyettos* at length, dismiss the etymology out of hand on the ground that the suffix is "pre-Hellenic."

But this suffix was so familiar that it continued to be used by the Greeks in such names as *Ἀλικαρνασσός Καρνησσόπολις*. *Hy-ettos* as a cross-formation is similar to Minnea-polis “Water-city.”

17. The ending -ας, -αντισο can be explained in more than one way: Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 1.526.

18. Wilamowitz (1931, 315n2) is cited in support, as by Parker (1983, 337), but he commends not this meaning but rather a special use of “Untiring.” “Beside the ancestors [*Tritopatreis*] they can only be heroes: all who *still keep their power* after death.”

19. This too has been mooted: Parker (1983, 337).

20. For the root, see Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 1.360, Chantraine, *DEGL*, and Frisk, *GEW* s. γαλσνῆ, γελσῶ, Γ πλζοντες, γλσνῆ, γληνζο.

21. So Dunst (1964).

22. So Kearns (1989, 181).

23. At Thoricus too an ox is sacrificed to Cephalus in *Skirophoriôn*, perhaps at midmonth (Daux 1983, 152–54 lines 54–56).

24. Ferguson (1938, 18), Kearns (1989, 82).

25. For the date and the context see Lambert (2000a, 45, 49, 51).

26. Most recently, Lambert (2000a, 45, 51).

27. Cook (1940, 142–57) gives a full account of the long-lived cult at the mouth of the Bosphorus.

28. It is not the style of powers of under-earth, so-called “chthonian” deities, as a general class; a low or earthen hearth altar is sometimes thought to be distinctive, but not a sunken chamber.

29. Underground installations and the reputation of Greek wind gods as greedy eaters are illustrated by Hampe (1967, 7–17) with many intriguing details from literature, folklore, and archaeology.

30. Only the Athenians worship *Tritopatreis*: Lobeck (1829, 1.766–67), E. Wüst, *RE* 7A 1 (1939) 326 s. *Tritopatores*, Cook (1940, 112–13). Only the Athenians have this ceremony and belief: Rohde (1925, 171), Jacoby on Phanodemus F 6, JJK 112.

31. Two small points do not affect the general interpretation. Kern, *Orph.* fr. 318, tacitly corrected γονεῖς αὐτῶν of the manuscripts to αὐτῶν; others ascribe the same sense to the transmitted text. To recall that Helios is also known as Apollo probably evokes Athens’ proud and distinctive cult of Apollo *patrōes*, very apposite to this matter of lineal descent (so Lobeck [1829, 1.762] and many since).

32. Hesiod’s primal pair are adduced by Lobeck (1829, 1.763) and Jacoby *ad loc.* It is also misguided to compare the genealogy of the Attic *Exêgêtikon*, discussed below.

33. As to ordinal “third” meaning “second” by inclusive reckoning, see chapter 12, p. 196, apropos of the phrase “in the third year” in line 23 of the tablet, a striking example.

34. Wind is a dry exhalation of the earth just as rain is a wet exhalation, and the sun determines what becomes of both at different times in different places (chapter 4); because of the sun, winds differ according to the seasons of the year and the regions of the earth (chapter 5); the twelve cardinal winds can be referred to the positions of the sun at the solstices and the equinoxes (chapter 6). As to chapter 6 see Thompson (1918, 49–52), McCartney (1930, 13).

35. Hsch. *Τριπατρεῖς· οἱ πρώτοι γεννώμενοι* is also conformable with Philochorus, though the abbreviated name is unexpected (cf. note 48).

36. Among the basic kinship terms, “the father of a grandfather or grandmother is *propappos*, as Isocrates says; *τάχα δ’ ἂν τοῦτον*

τριτοπάτορα Ἀριστοτέλης καλοῖ.” All the other terms are presented without surprises; this is an intrusive piece of learning.

37. Lobeck (1829, 1.760) (see Diog. Laert. 5.22 no. 15, Vit. Hsch. no. 183).

38. Bourriot (1976, 1158–72) makes it a question whether *Euergidai*, *Zakyadai*, *Pyrrhakidai* are ordinary families, *gene*, or phratries. For the first two, otherwise unknown, he leaves it altogether open, as does Parker (1996, 323). The *Pyrrhakidai*, however, appear elsewhere in the company of undoubted *gene* and are so registered by Bourriot (1161–72) and Parker (308)—and yet Bourriot (1171n249) and indeed Parker (284) still slightly hesitate. The deme *Aigilia*, where the *Pyrrhakidai* are at home, is on the south coast of Attica, whether at Phoinikia or Anavyssos: Traill (1986, 144–46). Lambert (1997, 104–5), plumping for Anavyssos, associates a dedication found there, IG 1³ 972 (naming four *archontes*), with the *Pyrrhakidai*, but leaves their nature undecided—as between *genos*, phratry, and even “kome-type.” At Cyrene, these proprietary cults had some importance, as we see from the reform in our inscription (chapter 19).

39. The terms *thyroroi* “doorkeepers” and *phylakes* “guards” in the *Exegetikon* are verbal echoes of *Theog.* 732, 735.

40. The first name takes somewhat different forms in different lexica and scholia and has also been emended without any sure result; see Kern’s apparatus.

41. Jacoby on Philochorus *FGH* 328 F 182 inadvertently says that the *Exegetikon* takes the names of the *Tritopatreis* from Hesiod’s Cyclopes. And he is a former editor of Hesiod.

42. The relationship of “son-in-law” is typical of wind gods, as we shall soon see.

43. Arist. *Meteor.* 1.1, 338b 26, 2.7–8, 365a 14–369a 9; cf. [*De mundo*] 4, 395b 30–396a 16, [*De herb.*] 1, 823a 3–15.

44. Hesiod’s account of the suppression and release is not straightforward; West gives a possible explanation in his note on lines 139–53; various lines may be athetized so as to restore a presumed original account.

45. The true sense was fatally obscured when Homer applied the name to his own invented race of one-eyed giants (cf. chapter 15, p. 251).

46. The Hundred-handers are only described as such by Hesiod (“a hundred hands darted out from their shoulders,” *Theog.* 150), but the very word *ἐκατόγχειρος* is used of *Briareôs* by Homer (Il. 1.402), who knows the whole story (cf. note 76).

47. Before this, Hesiod describes how Zeus engaged the Titans with his lightning so as to show the contribution of the Cyclopes, which does not quite suffice (lines 687–712).

48. As to Hsch. *Τριπατρῆς* and *Lex. rhet.* *Τριπάτορες* (*Anecd. Bekker* 1.317), both give meanings otherwise assigned to the wonted forms in *trito-*, so that these variants are without significance for our purpose. *Contra*, Hemberg (1954). *Tiriserōe* (dative) is probably a minor deity at Mycenaean Pylus and probably a compound of *τρίς* and *ἥρως*, but need not be related in any way; cf. Gerard-Rousseau (1968, 222–24).

49. Cf. Threatte, *Gram. of Att. Inscr.* 2.235.

50. Wüst, *RE* 7A 1 (1939) 324 s. *Tritopatores* speaks of “thems tradition,” but in general we may assume that the sources are correctly represented.

51. But not as Kretschmer (1920, 41) has it. He thinks that *Τριτοπατρῆς* was formed so as to fit *Τριτοπάτορες* to hexameter verse. We would then expect to find *Τριτοπατρῆς* mostly in the literary tradition and

Τριτοπάτορες in documents.

52. “The agent nouns in -τηρ and -τωρ,” says Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 1.531, “are supplanted by -της in Attic and Ionic ...as a living formation-category.” With -τωρ as with -τηρ there are many exceptions in literature, notably *ῥήτωρ* but also e.g. *ἑστιατωρ*, a liturgist. (Schwyzler notes that the ending has been revived in Modern Greek, as in *διδάκτωρ* “professor.”) As to kinship terms in -τωρ, Athenian literature keeps some that could hardly be avoided (e.g. *ἀπάτωρ* and *ἀμήτωρ*) and has an occasional *ὀμοπάτωρ* beside *ὀμοπάτριος*. But inscriptions have none at all.

53. The two instances of *ῥήτωρ* on a fifth-century stone and a fourth- or third-century *defixio* are “not entirely certain restorations”: Threatte, *Gram. of Att. Inscr.* 2.116. κλήτωρ is ousted by κληῖς in both literature and inscriptions.

φράτηρ on stone: Threatte 2.117.

54. Hesychius’ lemma *Τριτοπάτορας* probably comes from one of the Attic chroniclers; cf. Demon *FGrH* 327 F 2 as paraphrase.

55. Lippold (1911), Wüst, *RE* 7A 1, 324, Cook (1940, 123–28, 139), Jacoby on Phanodemus *FGrH* 325 F 6, Hemberg (1954, 186n28), Taillardat (1987, 1995) and

DELG Suppl. s. Τριτογένεια.

56. So Lippold and Taillardat (note 55). The form *tritogenes* is in fact a metrical variant of *tritogeneia*, well attested as such; it follows that the alleged “proverb” is a mere witticism, perhaps derived from comedy, and without significance.

57. The meaning “water” has often been upheld (cf. Wüst, *RE* 7A 1, 325, and likewise G. Kruse, *RE* 7A 1, 245 s. *Tritogeneia*), but without remarking the Vedic and Avestan parallel.

58. See in brief Wilamowitz (1893, 268nn), Kretschmer (1920, 38–40), Jacoby on Phanodemus F 6. Jacoby further says that only the second meaning is realistic. “Both explanations . . . are possible linguistically.. But according to the sense, only [great-grandfathers], being natural and unspeculative, is so.” He is wrong on both points.

59. So Wilamowitz. But he embraced the interpretation “third in the descending line” and thought of a mythical genealogy.

60. So Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 1.453, though affirming in note 5 that *tritopatores* is “old.”

61. Parker (1996, 156).

62. W. E. Thompson (1971, 110–11). The orators often have reason to speak of *kêdestês* as son-in-law: Thompson (110n5).

63. West *ad loc.* seems inadvertent in citing Herodotus for mention of Zetes and Calais.

64. Gantz (1993, 243).

65. S. Kaempf-Demetriadou, *LIMC* 3 (1986), Boreas 8–10, 19–26, all either “about 480 B.C.” or “480/470 B.C.” or “about 470 B.C.”

66. Perhaps Aelian meant no more than that they “(claimed) kinship with him” (N. G. Wilson, Loeb ed.), but his source will have spoken of a son-in-law.

67. Jacquemin (1979, 189–90).

68. Aelian’s story of Boreas ends with the note “Pausanias says this of Megalopolis too,” an obvious interpolation (cf. Habicht [1985, 1n1]).

69. So, but doubtfully, Jacquemin (1979, 191), Jost (1985, 527).

70. Jacquemin (1979, 191–93) argues most improbably that Aelian’s account of Boreas as “citizen” of Thurii derives from an actual citizenship decree, the only means by which the city could introduce a new cult. The laws of Charondas, she

says, had unalterably fixed the precincts allotted to the gods.

71. See Pearson (1987, 172, 301 [index s. "Aelian"]).

72. As we saw (chapter 9, pp. 151–52, Timaeus embroiders the downfall of Siris with a tale of pollution and of many commemorative statues that echoes and exceeds the story of Cylon and others like it.

73. Aeschylus' *Phineus*, produced in 472 B.C., is earlier than any of these (frs. 258–60 Radt), but its content is unknown except for trouble with the Harpies. Though further details of *Kleopatra* and the two sons and their torment are given by later sources, we cannot say where they came from. Gantz (1993, 351–52) brings them into some alignment but only by professed conjecture.

74. Robert (1921, 816–21) holds that Cleopatra and her sons were invented, and Phineus himself was transplanted from Arcadia to Thrace, "after Cimon's campaigns," when Athens took note of Thrace as a strategic region.

75. *Φίνεος < φθίνω* "blight"?

76. *Briareos*' alternative name *Aigaion* points to Poseidon. Homer, moreover, is fully acquainted with the role of the Hundred-handers in the succession of divine rulers. Whereas in Hesiod they give Zeus the help he needs against the Titans, in Homer *Briareos* does likewise against some upstart Olympians, an episode invented for the sake of Achilles' appeal to Thetis. Homer puns on the name *Briareos*, "for he

is even stronger than his own father (*οὐ πατρός*)," and thus evokes the motif of fathers supplanted by their sons and in particular the altercation between *Briareos*

and his own wrathful father Uranus (*Οβριάρειω δ' ὥς πρῶτα πατὴρ ὠδύσσατο θυμῷ*, Theog. 617). Yet Homer need not be acquainted with Hesiod's version of the succession, in which the Hundred-handers are inserted somewhat disjointedly (note 44) and the altercation between *Briareos* and Uranus is not explained.

Zeus *Milichios* in Summer

Synopsis

Column A, lines 17-24:

To *milichios* in [the land] of *Euthydamos* they shall sacrifice a ram. It is also allowed to sacrifice the victim every second year. One shall take out the holy objects that are public. And place the table in front. And burn up a thigh and the firstlings from the table and the bones. One shall not carry away the meat. One shall invite whomever he wishes.

It is also allowed to sacrifice at home every second year. They shall slay the animal. And they shall wash intestines and burn them up before statues. The victim shall be whatever the ancestral customs allow. One shall not take out [the holy objects that are public. And one shall give] threefold to a beggar in this third year. The omens shall be easy to understand.

Zeus *milichios* receives sacrifice at the end of the harvest, as he did at the beginning of spring. The sanctuary used for the purpose is the excavated one on the hill *Gaggera*, adjoining that of Demêtêr *malophoros*, goddess of the harvest. This setting, “the land of *Euthydamos*,” requires separate discussion in chapter 13. It is a private occasion, and the scale will vary according to individual means and individual success at the harvest. Indeed it may be left to every second year, and if so may even be observed at home, so long as a token offering is brought to the sanctuary. In the sanctuary version, whether it occurs every year or every second year, the victim is a costly ungelded ram, and the whole animal is consumed on the spot, so that a person invites all his friends to the feast. They gather at one of the *milichios* stones (a great many of these accumulated in the sanctuary). The rite of table hospitality, which joins the god with his worshippers, makes use of a table and a table service provided gratis by the authorities. The god’s portion is afterward burnt up, as with the *Tritopatreis*, but on an altar.

At home the victim may be as modest as a suckling pig, a choice attested elsewhere too. The god’s portion consists only of the intestines, to be carried to the sanctuary and washed and laid before a

milichios stone; table and table service are not provided. In lieu of guests, a beggar at the door receives a threefold share of meat. It is also evident that omens are taken from the victim's organs: the smallest of victims may not suffice for this purpose. The whole procedure is magical, in the sense that the worshipper exerts himself to his utmost capacity in order to make the god do likewise.

Alternative Forms of Sacrifice

Sacrifice to [Zeus] *milichios* in [the land] of *Euthydamos* makes an entry as long as the combined entry to *Tritopatreis* foul and pure. It consists of two main alternatives, either a sacrifice at the public shrine thus located (lines 17-20) or a sacrifice at home (lines 20-24). The sacrifice at home is less frequent, every second year. The sacrifice at the public shrine may likewise be deferred to the second year. So there are three alternatives in all, *a*, *b*, and *c*.

The language expressing these alternatives is as follows. The sacrifice each year at the public shrine, *a*, is prescribed with the imperative *θνόντες* "they shall sacrifice" (lines 17-18). The sacrifice every second year at the public shrine, *b*, and the sacrifice every second year at home, *c*, are both prescribed with the imperative

ἔστο δὲ καί. . . θύεν "it shall be also for one to sacrifice." i.e. "it is also allowed to sacrifice" (lines 18, 20-21). *ἔστο δὲ καί* + infinitive defines an alternative much more clearly than *ἔ (ῆ) καί* + imperative (or infinitive as imperative) would do.¹ And these are alternatives, not additions. If we say, "Do *a*, and it is also allowed to do *b* and likewise *c*," *b* and *c* can, in the nature of speech, be either additional or alternative. Here the context shows them to be alternative. Sacrifice *a* is for each year. Sacrifices *b* and *c* are alternatives, both for every second year.

JJK interpret the phrase *ἔστο δὲ καί* quite differently.² They are committed to the view that the rules on the tablet are an exceptional remedy, not a regular undertaking. If then *a* is once done in a given year, *b* and *c* may be done additionally in the year after.³ No parallel offers, however, for a remedy thus repeated, and no good reason is suggested. JJK are also, quite unwarrantably, puzzled by both the impersonal *ἔστι* and the imperative form *ἔστω*. These instructions, they say, are "presented only as a possibility, not a requirement, ' ' and the imperative is used to "guarantee the rights of the persons concerned ' ' to adopt an unusual possibility. This is too finespun. The imperative is the same as elsewhere in the tablet, and the expression is normal, as explained above.

Sacrifices *a* and *b* are offered at a shrine "in [the land] of

Euthydamos,” a phrase coordinate with “in [the land] of *Myskos*,’ ‘ which serves to locate a different shrine, the ground used for the great festival of early spring (chapters 8–9). The second shrine comes into use at a later season. The spring festival was very likely held in the valley of the *Cottone*, east of the city. West of the city, on the hill *Gaggera*, is the precinct of Zeus *milichios*, which has been known archaeologically for a long time. It is a contrasting location, with a field of *milichios* stones; it is used for the present occasion. When a person sacrifices at home, he must still bring the animal intestines to the *milichios* stones in the shrine.

Whether the sacrifice is offered at the shrine or at home, it is not part of any festival but a private undertaking. The only recorded festival of Zeus *milichios* is that of early spring—the *Diasia* of Athens and Thasos and, no doubt, the *Dia* of Teos, all dated to the month *Anthesterion*. At Athens, the festival goes closely with one of the *Semnai Theai*. At Selinus, Zeus *milichios* in [the land] of *Myskos* goes closely with a festival of the *Eumenides*. But Athens also has abundant evidence for private offerings to Zeus *milichios*, in the form of votive reliefs in which family groups approach the god.⁴ Xenophon describes his own private undertaking, probably in early summer, in a passage we come to shortly; he also says that it was a widespread custom.

The General Procedure

Sacrifice to *Tritopatreis*, whether fowl or pure, was conducted at the same chamber or pit; it was only that sacrifice to the pure kind involved an extra step, table offerings displayed for a while. Sacrifice to Zeus *milichios* is conducted either at the public shrine or at home but appears to be substantially the same in either case; it is only that sacrifice at home is very modest. Indeed the latter two options, of sacrificing every second year and of doing so at home, are both for the sake of economy.

These instructions, long as they are, are not so complete as they were for *Tritopatreis*. Sacrifice to Zeus *milichios* is more elaborate. And unlike sacrifice to *Tritopatreis*, it is an age-old custom that everyone knows; it is merely recalled for the present purpose. Details of sacrifice at the public shrine and of sacrifice at home are given piecemeal as required. They need to be listed in order, then combined, so as to produce a composite picture.

Here are the details of sacrifices *a* and *b*, performed each year or every second year at the public shrine in [the land] of *Euthydamos*. (1) A ram is sacrificed. (2) “The holy objects that are public’ ‘ are taken out. (3) The table is placed in front and, though this is left unsaid, heaped with food offerings. (4) A thigh and “the firstlings from the

table,” i.e. the food offerings, and the bones are burnt up. (5) No meat is carried away. (6) Other persons may be invited freely.

And here are the details of sacrifice *c*, performed every second year at home. (7) The victim is slain and of course butchered. (8) The intestines are washed and burnt up / set down before statues. (9) The victim is simply one allowed by ancestral custom. (10) [The holy objects that are public] are not taken out. (11) Threefold [is given] to a beggar. (12) [“The omens”], i.e. the organs extracted from the victim, must be “easy to understand,” i.e. must be sufficient for scrutiny—this detail was added later as a caveat.

For the most part, the respective details, those given for the alternative procedures in the public shrine and again at home, supplement each other neatly. First take 1 and 7, 9, 12. At the public shrine the victim is unusual and costly, a mature ungelded sheep; few such animals were available. Its organs will serve for omens as everyone watches. At home a lesser victim, of any age or kind allowed by custom, is butchered by a hand perhaps unskilled. It is important that the organs of the lesser victim be usable and visible as omens.

Next take 2-3 and 8, 10. At the public shrine “the holy objects that are public” are taken out for use in the ceremony: i.e. a table and table service. The table is placed in front and laid with meat, i.e. a carved portion, and no doubt cakes. After the sacrifice at home, the intestines are washed and burnt up / set down before statues. At the same time it is forbidden to “take out” [something]. It does not really matter what words we supply; this prohibition can only be the reverse of the previous injunction at the public shrine, “take out the holy objects that are public,” so that the table and table service are now withheld.

In the context of worshipping Zeus *milichios*, “statues” spoken of without ado will be the rough-hewn statues that typify the cult—the slabs, blocks, pyramids, herms that are often, though not at Selinus, inscribed “(Zeus) *milichios*,” “of (Zeus) *milichios*,” “I am (Zeus) *milichios*.”⁵ They have been found in many places but in unique concentration in the *Gaggera* precinct, where a few are inscribed with the names of owners, but most are uninscribed, and presumably available for general use.⁶ At home, as we well know, there are no statues of Zeus *milichios*.⁷ So this occasion still requires a visit to the shrine and a token offering at a *milichios* stone.⁸

Now take 5-6 and 11. At the public shrine the worshippers enjoy an ample feast. A large circle of family and friends are on hand—anyone may be invited for the purpose, which is to consume an entire ram on the spot. At home fewer partake, but one gives handsomely and auspiciously to a beggar at the door. Since the meat will not be carried away in any case, that expensive rule does not apply.

We are left with 4, a rule for the public shrine: a thigh and the offerings from the table and the bones are all of them burnt up. This is a fairly thorough burning up, though less than the burning of an entire victim denoted by *ὄλοκαυτεῖν*. To burn up a thigh on the altar is a well-known custom of Greek sacrifice from Homer onward. The thigh so burnt is the god's portion, somehow delivered to him in fire and smoke, whereas the worshippers dine on the rest. It is a different custom to lay a table for the god with dressed meat and other food, *theoxenia*, while the worshippers dine on the rest. As was mentioned before (chapter 10, p. 161), we do not usually hear of any further disposition of the table offerings. But for the pure *Tritopatreis* they were burnt up and placed in the chamber or pit that took the place of an altar; the thigh referred to as a "ninth" part must have been so treated as well. For Zeus *milichios* the table offerings, like the thigh, will be burnt up on the altar. Finally, "the bones" thus distinguished can only be the pile of bones left from the carving of all the meat. They too are burnt up on the altar.

The Shrine on Gaggera

The hills east and west of the city are occupied by public shrines; one of those on the western hill, *Gaggera*, belongs to Zeus *milichios*. A few of the *milichios* stones are inscribed with the names of the owners, whether one person or several; offerings were burnt up nearby, as more recent excavation has determined; there was an altar near the entrance in later times and probably long before. Now of the two precincts of Zeus *milichios* named in the tablet, "in [the land] of *Myskos*" and "in [the land] of *Euthydamos*," only the latter has furnishings that are distinctly mentioned or implied, because these private rites require them: scil. statues of Zeus *milichios* and an altar. We may infer with some assurance that the sanctuary on *Gaggera* is in view.

The sanctuary was excavated between 1915 and 1925 by E. Gabrici and reopened in 1969-70 by V. Tusa, who found early layers still intact in a few places, holding the answer to questions that had arisen.⁹ Its general history is now assured. The worship can be traced on the ground from the late seventh century; it is coeval with that of Demêtêr *malophoros*, adjacent on the south; both were brought by the first Greek settlers. Demêtêr's distinctive title derives from Megara in the homeland, whose daughter city Megara Hyblaea is Selinus' mother city. Zeus *milichios* too is attested at Megara in the homeland by a so-called boundary stone in just the area where Pausanias situates Demêtêr *malophoros*, the hill *Nisaia* (1.44.3).¹⁰ The two shrines were perhaps adjacent to each other at Megara, just as they are at Selinus,

indeed adjacent on a hillside. The stone at Megara gives Zeus *milichios* the further title *pamphylos*, or “of *Pamphylos*.” It sounds like a collective version of individual *milichios* stones.

On *Gaggera* the sanctuary area faces the valley of the *Modione* (Selinus) on a front of more than 30 m. and rises with the hill to the west (strictly to the southwest) for a distance of more than 60 m., farther than Demêtêr’s sanctuary.¹¹ Almost the whole area came to be filled with *milichios* stones, upward of two hundred.¹² The well-fashioned ones now kept at Palermo and Castelve- trano may be divided into five kinds (including ascertainable fragments).¹³ (1) Aniconic *stelai* with only a knob at the top, which are Greek, of the late sixth and the fifth century (4 examples).¹⁴ (2) *Stelai* with a head, Zeus’s, either incised in relief or sculpted in the round like a herm, of which some are Greek, fifth century, and some are Punic (8 examples). (3) *Stelai* with two heads, those of Zeus and a female consort, of which some are Greek, sixth and fifth century, and some are Punic, down to the late third century (62 examples in all, the commonest kind by far). (4) *Stelai* with two seated figures, much “schematized,” all c. 600 B.C.? (5 examples). (5) Slabs with four heads at the corners, undatable (2 examples).¹⁵ Most are uninscribed, but a few examples of (1) and (2) bear the names of Greek owners.

At the front of the sanctuary, at the northeast corner, a *naiskos* was built for Zeus *milichios* in the Punic period, and in front of this, though off its axis, farther north, a substantial stone altar was built as well, divided into two unequal sections by upright slabs.¹⁶ The altar has been compared to certain constructions of other times and places, including the Punic domain, in which two or three *stelai* or *baetyls* or pillars are set on a bench, perhaps as virtual images of the deities; whether these are shrines or altars is unclear. But if the slabs are simply meant to enclose and divide the area for offerings as between Zeus and his consort, no particular tradition need be invoked.¹⁷ At the front as at the rear the sanctuary extends beyond that of Demêtêr *malophoros*; like Demêtêr’s it is entered through a *propylon*. The two sanctuaries are similar in outline, except that the temple and altar of Demêtêr are much grander.¹⁸ Since both sanctuaries were maintained as before in the Punic period, it is likely enough that the *naiskos* and altar of Zeus *milichios* are replacements of earlier Greek structures, of which no trace remains.¹⁹ The Greek *milichios* stones were left standing throughout the same wide area where the Punic ones were now set up. This much ground at the northeast, and no more, had always been left free of the stones.²⁰

Remnants of sacrifice have been found throughout the sanctuary, charred bone and ash, sometimes beside *milichios* stones, sometimes together with votive pots and figurines; other *milichios* stones show

signs of burning.²¹ The only victims that have been surely identified are sheep, agreeing with the ram of the tablet.²² Within a separate enclosure marked by a row of stones were two hearth altars of different shape, oval and oblong, and more sacrificial debris.

It is not always granted, indeed it is more often denied, that the worship of Zeus *milichios* continued after 409 B.C. and is represented by many of the stones. According to JJK and others, Zeus *milichios* was superseded by the two Punic deities Baal Hammon and Tanit, the later stones merging with Punic iconography.²³ Even on general grounds such innovation is unlikely. Zeus *milichios* as a Greek deity of wide occurrence was undoubtedly familiar from an early date and attractive to Punic settlers throughout the Mediterranean, as were other Greek deities, notably Demêtêr—and she too survived unchanged on *Gaggera* (chapter 13, pp. 201–2). Philo of Byblus in his *Phoenician History* names Zeus *milichios* as a Greek equivalent, not the only one, but in one respect, of the important Phoenician deity Chusor / Hephaestus (Eustath. *Praep. Ev.* 1.10.11 = *FGrH* 790 F 2).²⁴ Nor is the Punic combination Baal Hammon and Tanit at all suitable. At Carthage, to be sure, these two are shown together on many votive stelai as the principal civic deities.²⁵ But they were seldom or never joined in cult; there the goddess Tanit was far more popular. The Punic stones at Selinus have nothing distinctive of either Baal Hammon or Tanit, no emblem or inscription.²⁶ Furthermore, it is not true at all that the stones depicting both god and goddess uniformly belong to the Punic period; they include some of the earliest. This, like other evidence, points to continuity of worship. The population later was mixed Greek and Punic, and if there was a dominating element, it was Greek culture. And we expect all inhabitants, both Greek and Punic, to be faithful to the old gods whose land it was.

The matter of a consort has an interest of its own. Deposits of the Greek period include many votive figurines of standing goddesses; they are likely to represent a consort.²⁷ It is true that she is not mentioned in the tablet or on the inscribed stones.²⁸ Turning away from Selinus to the evidence at large for Zeus *milichios*, we do not find her elsewhere shown in votive reliefs, nor elsewhere named in many, many inscriptions—except just three times. At Thespieae Zeus *milichios* is twice partnered by *Miliche* simpliciter and once at Hierapytna by Hera *milichia*.²⁹ The rare exceptions suffice to demonstrate what is surely a natural belief: the fertile god of under-earth dwells there in a conjugal state.³⁰

Such is the archaeological evidence. Let us imagine how the instructions of the tablet will be carried out in the excavated precinct. A ram is slaughtered, obviously at an altar—it might be one of the hearth altars or a predecessor of the stone-built altar. Organs are

extracted, and the meat is cut into large joints. The liver is inspected; the gall bladder sizzles in the altar fire; then a whole thigh is burnt up. This done, the worshippers gather up the meat and move away from whichever altar it is to the individual spot in the precinct where they will feast. They set up the table that is provided, together with vessels for the table offerings. And they prepare an impromptu hearth, perhaps represented for posterity by a burnt patch, and roast the meat all day long. Some of it is placed on the table, and the rest, many a hearty meal, is consumed by the family and invited guests. At the last, the table offerings are removed from the table, and they and the accumulated bones from all the feasting are carried back to the same altar used at the outset, so as to be burnt up.

Xenophon's Sacrifice

Xenophon at a difficult moment in 399 B.c. made a sacrifice of a certain kind to Zeus *milichios* and was rewarded with favorable omens (*Anab.* 7.8.1-6); as usual with ever-sanguine Xenophon, the omens were immediately fulfilled. The expression that he uses for the sacrifice, *θεσθαι καὶ ὀλοκαυτεῖν*, can only now be understood. It shows that the rules at Selinus are based on a widespread custom.

He had just returned from Thrace to Asia Minor hoping for service in the field with Sparta, late spring or early summer it must have been. He was very short of money. His old friend Eucleides of Phlius, newly met and a notable seer, did not believe it until he saw the victims Xenophon sacrificed to Apollo.³¹ "Zeus *milichios* is in your way," said Eucleides with the authority of a seer, and he asked

Xenophon if he had yet sacrificed *ὥσπερ οἴκοι ... εἰώθειν ἐγὼ ὑμῖν θύεσθαι καὶ ὀλοκαυτεῖν*; just as I was wont to sacrifice among you at home, seeking omens and burning up entirely." No, "he had not sacrificed at all to this god since he left home." Being urged to do so now by Eucleides, Xenophon went on his way, and the next day *ἐθύετο καὶ ὀλοκαύτει χοίρους τῷ πατρίῳ νόμῳ* sacrificed porkers, seeking omens and burning up entirely in the ancestral manner."³² Or "porkers they were that he sacrificed for omens and burnt up entirely, in the ancestral manner." Eucleides first uses the pair of verbs intransitively, then Xenophon supplies the single object that is the point of the story.³³

The pair of verbs are a succinct rendering of the sacrificial procedure in the tablet. The middle form *θύεσθαι* is often used of sacrificing so as to obtain omens, an important part of the sacrifice to Zeus *milichios* either at the shrine or at home. The term *ὀλοκαυτεῖν*, normally used of burning up an entire victim, can do duty for the burning up of the thigh and the table offerings and the bones, a much

more extensive burning up than usual. Xenophon means to describe the procedure in two words, and it would be hard to find two others that are better.³⁴

Eucleides speaks of the procedure as a general custom; he took part in it “among you at home.”³⁵ Possibly he had been active at Athens and means to remind Xenophon of this and of the Athenian cult of Zeus *milichios*. But given the example of Selinus, there is no reason to think that Athens differed in some respect from the rest of Greece. It is more likely that Eucleides refers to the usual practice throughout the Greek homeland, and that Xenophon speaks to the common experience of all his readers.

The story distinctly implies that Zeus *milichios* is worshipped at just this season and for the purpose of seeking omens and that it is practicable and salutary for even an indigent person to do so. The least of victims may be used. “The victim shall be whatever the ancestral customs allow,” says Selinus’ tablet, offering the same recourse.

“Threefold to a Beggar”

We return to a textual problem described in chapter 1 (pp. 25–26). The reading in line 23 of the tablet is very strange:

τ[...].ιτοιαπτοχοιτριτουφετ[, with either ο, θ, δ, or ρ as the fourth letter. The words πτοχοι τρίτοι φέτ[ει must be granted. Before them, the only likely restoration is τ]ρίτοια, already suggested by JJK. It is the word otherwise appearing as τρίττ- ΟΓ τρίκτ- ΟΓ τριπτ-. Though the spelling has been assimilated to τρίτος, the ending -οια points to the stem τριχ- meaning “threefold.”³⁶ It should not be assumed, however, that it is a feminine noun, nominative singular, meaning “a sacrifice with three components” (so JJK). The “threefold” words are of variable form and meaning.

The forms τρίτοια, τρίττοα are used in Athenian inscriptions.³⁷ The literary form was τριττῦα ΟΓ τριττῦα, cited from Callimachus and Ister in the lexica.³⁸ This is indeed a feminine singular noun denoting a threefold sacrifice, mostly identified as ram, boar, bull—three ungelded males of three leading species—the perfect threefold, one might say.³⁹ Forms and meaning are Attic. Another

Attic form with another Attic meaning is τριττος. Though it denotes a “third” of each of Cleisthenes’ ten *phylai* (an assimilation of meaning like the assimilation of form at Selinus), the use is secondary to the old Attic *trittys* and *phyle*. The old Attic *trittys*, we are free to suppose, meant not a “third” but a “threefold.” Four *phylai* with three units each

make twelve, i.e. the twelve phratries (Arist. *Ath.* fr. 3).⁴⁰ It is an early use, and *τριττός* is an authentic noun form. The forms *τρίττοια*, *τρίττοα* must originate as adjectives, with *θυσία* understood. This use is not so early.

Beside other *τρίττ-* and *τρίκτ-* forms in the lexica, Hesychius has *τρίκτειρα*, defining it as a sacrifice to Enyalios, and of ungelded victims. This might be taken as an instance outside Athens.⁴¹ But words in *-τειρα* are often poetic.⁴² Though Callimachus is said to have spoken of *τρίττυα* as the sacrifice of three ungelded victims, this is not a verbatim quotation. Very likely the form *τρίκτειρα* is his, and very likely it was used of an Attic instance.⁴³

Only two non-Attic instances are reliably attested, both Doric, both instructive.⁴⁴ Sophron in his play about exorcising Hecate from a house said “a *τρίκτῦς* of *alexipharmaka* in a *kyathis* has been buried beneath,” i.e. beneath the threshold (fr. 3 K-A). This threefold belongs to ritual, but size and circumstance are modest. The Amphictyonic law of 380 b.c. has the obscure prescription
]ς ἑφοδὸν θύεν ἐν Ἀνεμαίαιστῶι τ[ρ]ικτεύαν κηνυμ[
 (CID 1.10 line 34).⁴⁵ Someone is told to sacrifice *τρίκτεοα κηοα* at a certain place; a penalty, as it seems, is prescribed for one who does not.⁴⁶ This seems to be “a threefold burning,” whether it is a holocaust of animal victims or some lesser rite. It is an adjective use such as we discerned behind the noun *τρίττοια*.

On this showing the *τρίττοια* of our tablet is likely to be an adjective, neuter plural, without a noun. It is likely to mean simply “threefold.” The following *πτοχοι* is likely to be dative singular, as indirect object. And the matter in question can hardly be other than giving to a beggar. Hence *καὶ δό]/-τ[ο τ]ρίττοια πτοχοῖ τρίτοι φέτ[ει* “and he is to give threefold to a beggar in the third year.” Or is it “in the second year”?

We must remember the Greek habit of counting inclusively, even at the shortest intervals.⁴⁷ The phrase *τρίτοι φέτει* can signify either “every third year,” “in the third year,” or “every second year,” “in the second year.” Festival cycles other than annual are always counted inclusively, beginning with *τρίετηρος* “biennial cycle,” which was in fact the commonest of all, describing the festivals of Dionysus, god of wine, as they once were celebrated everywhere. Since they promote or celebrate the growth and maturation of this staple crop, they run from the pruning in winter of one year to the broaching of jars in spring of the next.⁴⁸ As the standard term for a biennial festival, *trieteris* worked by analogy on the other terms for longer intervals, e.g. *penteteris* “quadrennial cycle.” Apart from the standard

term, any ritual occurring at a two-year interval would probably be so described. An inscription of Oaxus on Crete requires the council to supply funds for certain sacrificial victims $\tau^{\iota}\sigma\tau\omicron\iota = 4\tau\epsilon\iota$ —"every second year," it is natural to suppose (ICr 2.9 = *LSSuppl* 113).⁴⁹

Here $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\iota \text{ } \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\iota$ has been taken to signify a different interval from before, "in the third year" (all these clauses are taken by JJK as exceptional remedies). Now the two-year interval is twice prescribed, for sacrifice at the public shrine and then for sacrifice at home, with the phrase $\pi\epsilon\delta\grave{\alpha} \text{ } \acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ "after a year" (lines 18, 20). This might be thought to indicate a different sense for our phrase $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\iota \text{ } \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\iota$. But we are still concerned with sacrifice at home. It is allowed to sacrifice at the public shrine at a two-year interval as an economy, and it is allowed to do so at home as a further economy. Giving threefold to a beggar belongs to the sacrifice at home. Beggars come to the house door; they would be banned from a public shrine. Our phrase does not again prescribe an interval, whether of two years or three. It refers to the interval already stated by the other phrase. It means in effect "in this second year."

The thought and the expression may even have been suggested by the rule for sacrificing $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\iota \text{ } \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\iota$ a $\tau^{\iota}\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ occasion calls for $\tau^{\iota}\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\alpha$. Elsewhere in the tablet

$\mu\tilde{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon \text{ and } \acute{\eta}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho \text{ } \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \text{ } \acute{\alpha}\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\iota$ are carefully chosen expressions. So I translate "in this third year," counting like a Greek; otherwise the translation will obscure the assonance.

Giving to a beggar is auspicious. The principle is *do ut des*.⁵⁰ Beggars have a mandate, as it were, to promise a return. Children do so when they come to the house door to beg for treats, as in the *eiresiônê* song ascribed to Homer (*Vit. Hom.* 52). "Wealth will arrive in plenty... May all your jars be full, and may barley dough always overflow the kneading trough." It is a magical belief and operates especially at harvest time, which is the time to honor Zeus *milichios* in the land of *Euthydamos*, as we shall see.

Plato's myth of the begetting of *Eros* may also be compared. This procreative deity is himself begotten of *Penia* "Poverty" as she begs—which illustrates the magical belief. Socrates (he attributes the story to the midwife Diotima) imagines a festive occasion that brings *Penia* as

a beggar to the house door $\omicron\tilde{\iota}\omicron\nu \text{ } \delta\grave{\eta} \text{ } \epsilon\upsilon\omega\chi\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma \text{ } \omicron\upsilon\sigma\eta\varsigma$ "just because there was plenty to eat" (*Symp.* 203b). So there was at Selinus, on that day, in that house, in line 23. The occasion here is Aphrodite's birthday. But Aphrodite's birthday and *Erôs'* begetting are also their real-life festival in Athens, celebrated on the fourth of *Munichion* = April. The shrine of Aphrodite and *Eros* on the Acropolis north slope was excavated in the 1930s, together with inscriptions and some

remarkable votive objects that show that Athenian households honored them both on this day for their role in the begetting of children.⁵¹ It is not long before the harvest, and human and natural fertility are allied.⁵² The occasion imagined by Socrates is similar to that of the tablet.

1. Such a use of $\eta\kappa\alpha\iota$ would not be comparable to any of the examples given by Denniston (1950, 306–7).

2. JJK 15, 37–38, 64–65, 70; so too Jameson (1994, 43–44).

3. JJK 38 go further still. They envisage a continuing need for purification “in the following year *and perhaps even in a third year*” (my emphasis). But the ordinal number $\tau\rho\epsilon\tau\omega\iota$ refers by inclusive reckoning to the two-year interval already mentioned. The clause in question will be discussed at the end.

4. JJK 82–83 give ten examples at Athens, Peiraeus, and Sunium. The Sunium example, however, was never fully published and may not have been inscribed at all, as R. S. Stroud observes at SEG 50.207. Zeus *philios* then has a rival claim, as with additional examples at Peiraeus mentioned by JJK 83. There are also votive reliefs of a different kind at Corcyra and Ephesus: JJK 86, 88.

5. Examples offer from Corinth, Sicyon, Megara, Lebadeia, Thyrreum, Chios, Arcesine, and Amathus, if we include some that are reported as boundary stones: JJK 83–89. Some slabs or blocks are inscribed as the simplest of dedications; so is one of the *milichios* stones at Selinus. Here twelve *milichios* stones are somehow inscribed, but many more that came to light, perhaps two hundred, were uninscribed—and those left on the site are now hard to recognize! So Fama in Fama and Tusa (2000, 21). On this showing, innumerable stones elsewhere may once have been statues of Zeus *milichios*.

6. JJK 89–91, 103–107, cf. Doepner (2002, 133–35).

7. Nothing whatever, in either the written or the material record, points to any domestic cult of Zeus *milichios*. He is very like the domestic forms of Zeus but is not to be counted among them: so Nilsson (1932a, 224–27), as against H. Sjövall (1931). Nilsson (1940, 69) remarks as a matter of general interest that he does not occur in house cult. JJK 39–40 are therefore wrong to think of the *agalmata* as standing “at home”—where they also situate a conjectural ox sacrifice (see chapter 1, p. 24). As to both images and sacrifice, they cite a Hellenistic cult foundation prescribing a ram sacrifice beside the statue of the heroized youth Aleximachus (*LSSuppl.* 61.75–76, Aegiale, c. 100 B.C.). That statue, however, stood in the gymnasium where the city fathers, the ephebes, and the *neOteroi* celebrate a commemorative festival.

8. Something similar was done on the second day, called *Choes*, of the festival *Anthesteria*. Whereas the ritual of the first and third days, and it was of several kinds, took place in public, at the city center and in the streets and at temporary shrines, everyone stayed at home on the second day, though of course with company if desired, topping from a jug of neat wine, the *choes*. It was only at the end of the day that they made their way uncertainly to the sanctuary of Dionysus *en limnais* in order to deliver any remnants for a collective dousing of the sacrificial goat. The ensuing sacrifice was of course a public occasion, the only time when the sanctuary was opened to the public. For a full account see Robertson (1993, 218–27). Otherwise the requirement is similar, to carry either a jug with leftover wine or a bundle of intestines from home to the sanctuary.

9. Tusa (1977), Dewailly (1992, 1–40), Tusa in Fama and Tusa (2000, 9–15); cf. JJK 133–36.

10. So Curti and van Bremen (1999, 24). They observe that both hills are beside

the city harbor, and point to other similarities in the topography of Megara and Selinus. Megara's *milichios* stone was mentioned in chapter 8, note 7, for its possible bearing on the involvement of kinship groups in the cult.

11. The ancient riverbed was far wider, extending right up to the sanctuary (Tusa in Fama and Tusa [2000, 12n7]).

12. The *milichios* stones removed from the site and placed in a museum number 99 (89 at Palermo, 2 at Castelvetro, 8 at Malibu). Some 20 more roughly fashioned are left standing (all are clearly seen in Fama and Tusa [2000, pl. 3.1]). Gabrici, while reckoning the worked stones at a hundred or so, spoke of a *larger number* that were only oblong stones or elongated rock fragments; except for those 20, they have not survived in situ.

13. Fama in Fama and Tusa (2000, 33–57).

14. This kind is likened by Fama (61) to the blocks surmounted by a cone or “*omphalos*” at Lebadeia, which are inscribed for the god: Jannoray (1941), Schachter (1981, 148; 1986, 124; 1994, 119).

15. Being unparalleled, the two rude sculptures are “of extraordinary interest”; perhaps they indicate the two realms over which the pair of deities preside, “of life and of death.” So Fama (79). Or the two realms might be those of new growth in spring, just below the earth and just above it.

16. Tusa (1977, 116–17), Fama (1980, 38–39), Shaw (1989, 179–80), JJK 136, Tusa in Fama and Tusa (2000, 11, pls. 3.2, 7.1).

17. So in fact JJK 136n4.

18. The congruence of the two sanctuaries is plain on Gabrici's site plan, often reproduced. Miles (1998b, 36) provides an aerial photograph of both that is better still.

19. See further Fama in Fama and Tusa (2000, 81–82). “It would be desirable to undo the knot as regards the dating of the altar with two sections” (82III07).

20. A Greek stone was however laid in the foundations of the *naiskos*—a simple *stêlē* with a knob, of the end of the sixth century, inscribed with the name Alvias: Fama in Fama and Tusa (2000, 34, 60, 82, pl. 13.3). Was the legendary hero known to the Punic builders of the early fourth century?

21. JJK 135–36 and Tusa in Fama and Tusa (2000, 11) give summary accounts.

22. As JJK 133 remark, the bones of birds and rodents also reported are unlikely to come from sacrifice.

23. JJK 60, 103, 134, 137–138, cf. White (1967, 347–49, 351), Tusa (1971), and now Doepner (2002, 133–34). White (349) speaks of “a half-completed synthesis,” and JJK 137 speak of “a syncretism” between Greek and Punic.

24. Chusor and Hephaestus invented arts and crafts respectively (implying, no doubt, that their respective worshippers are contemplative and practical), and Hephaestus, after inventing the boat and the fishing line, “was the first of all mankind to *πλεῦσαι* go sailing; therefore they worshipped him as a god after death, and he is also called Zeus *milichios*.” This particular equation was surely suggested by the Semitic word for “sailor,” Hebrew *mallah*, Assyrian *malahu*. Cook (1925, 1109–10) cites Semitic scholars who have thought so. JJK 140n8 dismiss the “proposed connection” out of hand, apparently without cognizance of Philo. Punic ears at Selinus must likewise have heard “sailor” in *milichios*.

25. See White (1967, 347), citing also a single example from Lilybaeum.

26. As JJK 138 concede.

27. Dewailly (1992). JJK 135 make it a question whether the figurines depict a female deity or only point to female worshippers, but the alternative is unconvincing.

28. Coins of Selinus show a rearing snake and a consenting woman, for whom Zuntz (1971, 397–98) entertains an older identification as Zeus and Persephone. The

woman is more likely the local nymph Eurymedusa: so G. Berger-Doer, *LIMC* 4 (1988) Eurymedousa 2, though her further suggestion of Eurynome and Ophion is unwarranted.

29. See JJK 84, 87, 97–98. Hera was a natural choice at Hierapytna, being otherwise prominent, much more so than usual on Crete: Sporn (2002, 55).

30. According to JJK 97, it is only alate development. “The appearance of a female *paredros* in two cities may show the assimilation of the cult, by the Hellenistic and Roman periods, to the common pattern.” For “the common pattern” they cite *IG* 2² 4627 (but give a wrong number), an Attic relief formally describing *Agathe Tyche* as “wife” of *Zeusphilios* (and *Philia* as his “mother”). This, however, is a momentary invention, as is well brought out by Parker (1996, 231).

31. ἰδὼν δὲ τὰ ἱερὰ . . . εἶπεν ὅτι πείθοιτο αὐτῷ.

32. Or else πατρώϊωι. The manuscripts are unequally divided, and this is the lesser reading but also the harder one.

33. The passage has been discussed with differing results by authorities on Greek sacrifice. Rudhardt (1958, 286–87) holds that the pair

θύειν [*sic*] καὶ δλοκαυτεῖν constitute a “hendiadys” for a holocaust sacrifice, a rite so infrequent as to require this emphasis. Jameson (1965, 163) infers “normal sacrifice as well as the holocaust of pigs” because “*kallierein*” points away from “*sphagia*.” Ekroth (2002, 224), citing both, leaves the choice open between one rite and two, remarking that in any case “the money for the army arrived [at once].” Such comment respects neither the context nor Xenophon’s usage. For omen-taking Xenophon mostly uses *θεσθαι* alone (Casabona [1966, 86–87]). Porkers are therefore mentioned as a frugal means for the purpose, not as a curious detail of a separate holocaust—as if Xenophon wrote only for serious students of religion.

34. Pausanias uses four operative words to describe the mode of sacrifice in the cult of Heracles at Sicyon:

σφάζαντες καὶ . . . καύσαντες τὰ μὲν ἐσθίουσιν . . . τὰ δὲ . . . ἐναγίζουσι (2.10.1). The victim throughout is a lamb; perhaps he might have said

ἄρνα θύουσι καὶ ἐναγίζουσι, and perhaps Xenophon might have said of the porkers ἐθύετο καὶ ἐνήγιζε. But in Classical Greek the latter verb is intransitive, so *χορσος* could not appear as a shared object.

35. οἱκοι . . . ὑμῖν. Is he addressing Xenophon as an Athenian or as a Greek? As an Athenian, says Kett (1966, 41n2) and again Schwabl, *RE Suppl.* 15 (1978) 1084 s. Zeus. But if the custom is general, as Schwabl agrees, it can only be as a Greek.

36. See Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 1.597, Frisk, *GEW*, and Chantraine, *DELG* s. τριπτύς.

37. Threatte, *Gram. of Attic Inscr.* 1.326, 538.

38. Phot. etc. s. τριπτύαν = Callim. fr. 587, Ister *FGrH* 34 F 51. For details of the lexica see Pfeiffer and Jacoby *ad locc.*, also G. Rougemont on *CID* 1.10 line 34, the Amphictyonic law of 380 B.C.

39. A threefold sacrifice of the species ox, sheep, and pig is widely evident apart from the term *trittoa*: A. Hermay and M. Leguilloux, *ThesCRA* 1 (2004) 110 nos. 416–25 s. Sacrifices.

40. See Robertson (1992, 58–74; 1998b, 117–19).

41. The form is not in fact considered by those who write most fully on *trittoa* (Stengel, Eitrem, Ziehen as cited by Jacoby on Ister).

42. Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 1.596.

43. Callimachus speaks of certain female officiants at Athens (the *Hesychides*) as

λήιτειραι, perhaps a word of his own devising (fr. 681).

44. A third Doric instance must be doubted. Pausanias Atticus cited “Epicharmus” as showing that τριτταν was an “ancient” word for a “sacrifice of three animals, as of two sheep and an ox” (fr. 182 K-A). This surprising report sounds most like an ill-informed notion of *τρίττοια βόαρχος*. The “three-year-old” victims asserted by Ister are thought to be another ill-informed notion. If so, the authority is wrongly named. Kaibel suspected the name, but on the ground,

unwarranted, that the Doric form should be *τρικτύα*.

45. Rougemont’s reading of the line supersedes earlier editions.

46. *κηύ<αν> μ[ὴ] θύσαντι*. This was J. Baunack’s suggestion, but he supposed that the letters before the lacuna could all be read. Rougemont leaves the line unrestored and unexplained.

47. *διὰ τρίτης* means “every other day” in medical writers (*LSJ* s. τριςτο II 1).

48. See Robertson (2003b, 229–32).

49. *κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ τοῖς / Κυδαντείοις
διδόμεν τρίτο-/ι Φέτει τὰν βολὰν
ἰς τὰ θύ-/ματα δυνόδεκα στατήρῃανς* (lines 11–14).

50. So Nock (1925, 32), citing the *eiresione* song.

51. Robertson (2005, 59–61). The mythical setting reflects the ritual one. It is self-evidently the house of Olympian (or *uranios*) Zeus, father of Aphrodite on a normal view, where the birthday is celebrated and the other gods are gathered, but unexpectedly the house has a *kepos* “garden” in which *Penia* seduces *Poros*. Athenian households worship Aphrodite *urania* at a shrine *en kepois*.

52. Other myths inspired by this and other north-slope shrines, for which see Robertson (2005, 62–68), insist on the alliance of natural and human fertility. It is a secondary custom, let us note in passing, for devotees to go round begging on behalf of certain deities, goddesses of either natural or human increase, e.g. the Mother or Hera, who therefore make return; cf. Robertson (1983).

After the Harvest

Synopsis

Zeus *milichios* and Demeter *malophoros* are worshipped side by side on the hill *Gaggera* at a pair of shrines that are plainly related. This is “the land of *Euthydamos*,” on the opposite side of the city from “the land of *Myskos*.” The season now is also the opposite. Demeter’s epithet comes from the festival * *Malophoria*, which gives its name to the month of June in the calendars of Megara and its colonies. The festival celebrates the winnowing of the grain that marks the end of the harvest. The “apple-bearing” of the epithet has been misunderstood; “apple” is sometimes an expressive color term meaning “white,” the flesh rather than the skin; the whiteness of the winnowed grain typifies the harvest throughout Greek literature. Now Demeter in her monumental sanctuary is visited by a festival procession, but Zeus *milichios* is approached only by families from day to day in the often humble style we saw in chapter 12. Accordingly, Demeter has no place in the tablet with its special purpose of accommodating lesser persons. Yet the worship of both deities belongs to “the land of *Euthydamos*” since this name evokes every “ordinary member of the *dêmos*.” The worship of both demonstrates the solidarity of the community at harvest time, and also makes a contrast with the “pollution” of early spring as a threat that hangs over the whole community.

Once again, we find the same pattern at Athens. Whereas the worship of early spring was concentrated in *Agra* at the southeast, that of harvest time is concentrated on the Hill of the Nymphs at the west. The ancient name of the hill is *Hyakinthos*, a flower evoking this season just as *Agra* “Chase” does the other. As on *Gaggera*, there are two important shrines, of the Nymphs and of Zeus *milichios*, and the worship takes opposing forms, a grand procession to the Nymphs and modest private offerings to Zeus *milichios*. As to the Nymphs, they are entreated just days before Athens’ festival of the threshing, the

Skiophoria. The aetiologies of both—of the offerings to the *Nymphs* and of the festival *Skiophoria*—make up the famous story of the battle between Athens and Eleusis—of the sacrifice of Erechtheus' daughters at the hill *Hyakinthos* and of the victory of Erechtheus at the plowland Scirum. Demeter does not appear in this scenario because Athens' threshing festival was a relatively late creation, exalting Athena and Poseidon as deities of the Acropolis. We do know, however, that both Demeter and Zeus *milichios* were installed near Scirum in cults reproducing those of the city. As to Zeus *milichios*, his sanctuary on the Hill of the Nymphs has been recognized only lately. He was worshipped privately, not at crude *milichios* stones but with splendid votive reliefs showing either a bearded patriarch or a coiling snake. Finally, for the combined worship of the Nymphs and of Zeus *milichios* Athens has a locative term that matches “in the land of *Euthydamos*.” It is *Dêmiāsi* “at the rites of the *dêmos*.”

“In the Land of *Euthydamos*”

The shrine where sacrifice is offered to Zeus *milichios* is ἐν Εὐθυδάμο, a phrase coordinate with ἐν Μόσφο, used of the occasion in early spring.¹ That phrase is to be completed as ἐν [χόροι] ὁσφο “in [the land] of *Myskos*,” i.e. of “Pollution.” The occasion then was the festival elsewhere called *Diasia* or *Dia*, known for its large attendance. The story of Empedocles' epiphany shows that it was well attended at Selinus too. And the story suggests a suitable location, on the bank of the *Cottone* east of the city.

At this later season, the sacrifice takes place in the excavated sanctuary of Zeus *milichios* on the hill *Gaggera* or, if it takes place at home, includes a visit to the sanctuary. The sanctuary is to be found “in [the land] of *Euthydamos*.” It is a matching location, a long low hill west of the city. The area so called cannot be restricted to Zeus *milichios* alone since Demeter *malophoros* is right beside him; the two precincts share a common wall. And Demeter has a festival of great importance, the **Malophoria*, at the same season as our private sacrifice, suggesting that “the land of *Euthydamos*,” like that of *Myskos*, is a place of general resort.² The festival is outside the scope of the tablet, like all festivals except the two of early spring. Yet the **Malophoria*, in celebrating the harvest, explains why Zeus *milichios* is worshipped as well.

As with *μύσκος, εὐθύδημον* (acc.) is glossed as a common noun; it is said to mean *ἀπλουν δημότην* “ordinary member of the *dêmos*” (Hsch., Phot. s.v.). Somehow, the two terms express the contrast inherent in the two seasons, the contrast between anxiety and relief. In early spring, there is a compulsive fear that some unknown

“pollution” may prove ruinous to the whole community. After the harvest, the whole community gives thanks, every “ordinary member of the *dêmos*”.

The word is quoted from Euripides’ *Antiope* (Eur. fr. 227 Kannicht / 278 Mette). In this play the twins Zethus and Amphion are portrayed as opposite types, practical and contemplative, and they dispute which of them is more serviceable to the state. The dispute stood out, being cited in Plato’s *Gorgias* and in Horace, *Epistle* 2.17. Our term may belong to the dispute or else to some related passage.

Yet we should not suppose that the term was in use at Thebes; more likely, Euripides and his audience knew it from their own experience. The reason for thinking so is the distribution of the personal name *Euthydêmos* or *Euthydamos*. It is fairly common throughout the Greek world and is very common at Athens. Of course, it need not evoke the toponym, but if the toponym occurred locally, we would expect the personal name as well—it is well attested in Dorian lands, including Sicily, even if Selinus is not yet represented apart from our tablet (*LGPN* I). It is however conspicuously absent from the whole of Boeotia except Oropus (*LGPN* III). And at Athens we shall see that the toponym *Δημίασι* is likely to be related.

It happens that the curious phrase *ᾧσπερ Εὐθόδημον* vel *εὐθόδημον* has come to light in Callimachus’ *Iambus* 3. The speaker is a sanctimonious self-pitying reprobate who has seemingly been disfranchised. Whether he cites the name or applies the term, he uses it of a young acquaintance who has prospered undeservedly. It is likely to be ironic.³

The Sanctuary of Demeter *Malophoros*

The sanctuaries of Zeus *milichios* and of Demeter *malophoros* are side by side on *Gaggera*, with a common wall between them. Other sanctuaries to north and south are farther off and plainly unrelated. These two were doubtless installed at the same time, soon after the founding of the city, though only Demeter’s has material that is recognizably of early date. It is somewhat larger, about 60 m. east-west and 50 m. north-south.⁴ (The eastward orientation of both sanctuaries has been shifted to the northeast to suit the ground, but for the sake of clear directions we may ignore this.) The entrance leads straight to a very large altar, with much residue of sacrifice there and all around, and many votive pots and figurines.⁵ The temple behind it, a large but simple building of stone, dates to the late sixth century, a predecessor to the early sixth century. At the entrance stands a handsome propylon of the later fifth century, which has been investigated recently and restored on paper; it is a monument unique

in Sicily.⁶ Right in front of the propylon, requiring any double file of processioners to part and rejoin, is a well or at least a circular curb. Beside the propylon on the south, outside Demeter's precinct, is a small precinct of Hecate.

The precinct was well maintained throughout the Punic period, and the worship continued with Demeter's usual figurines. Tanit, however, is proposed as a Punic interpretation of Demeter.⁷ It has indeed been shown that the temple underwent a certain transformation.⁸ The rearmost part, an adyton, was reconstructed with much thicker walls to support a vaulted roof in place of a gable roof, and the outside face of the walls was left unfinished and with some blocks projecting sharply. This combination of features proves that the rearmost part, where the slope rises, was now covered over with earth; the projecting blocks kept the earth in place as long as it was loose. It must be that when the city was destroyed in 409 B.C. and the area was abandoned for some time, sliding earth and blowing sand became a problem such as modern archaeologists have encountered. The reconstruction was a permanent remedy, probably adopted as soon as the area returned to use. Given the undoubted practical purpose, it is hardly reasonable to say that the temple was also meant to resemble a tomb or an entrance to the underworld because Tanit and Demeter shared such an interest. The new roof only made Demeter more secure.

The small finds, in particular the votive figurines, do not indicate that Demeter was other than her ordinary self, the goddess of the grain. The sanctuary with its temple and propylon is indeed much grander than most of the excavated sanctuaries of Demeter, where women gathered in seclusion to work their magic on the staple crop. But Demeter's sanctuary at Eleusis is very grand; both men and women joined in the worship, as at other so-called "Eleusinian" sanctuaries.⁹ Eleusis seems to be the model for Selinus. The propylon, the well or curb, and the shrine of Hecate each reproduce a leading feature at Eleusis. And at Eleusis these features are also famous in story: the well *Kallichoron* and the goddess Hecate, alias *Artemis propylaia*. Everyone at Selinus knew Eleusis by repute, and some at first hand.

If the local sanctuary is endowed with comparable splendor, it is likely that the whole city turned out for the festival, men as well as women. It was a man, Theyllus son of Pyrrhias, who dedicated some votive object and described it as $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \epsilon\nu\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\text{-} / \gamma\omicron\nu$ (LSAG² 277 no. 42 = IGDS 54 = *Iscr. Sic.* I² 38).¹⁰ It must be a thank-offering for an abundant harvest of grain.

The epithet *μαλοφόρος* and the month name *Μαλοφόριος*, implying a festival **Μαλοφορία*, are found only at Megara and her colonies.¹¹ The first element is *μᾶλον* (*μῆλον*), “apple” or “quince,” so that the goddess and the festival processioners seem to be described as carrying the ripe fruit, whichever kind it is, at harvest time.¹² That would be surprising for the grain goddess. Demeter’s epithet has been fruitlessly debated, if I may put it so, both in ancient and in modern times; a rival explanation fixes on *mêlon* “sheep.”

The grain goddess was exalted at Megara. The city name denotes the eerie sacrificial pits of seedtime ritual; the search for *Korê* was situated here in defiance of neighboring Eleusis (Paus. 1.43.2).¹³ The month *Malophorios* appears at Byzantium, a colony of Megara that has left us one of the very few monthly calendars preserved entire. It is the second month before *Karneios*, a linchpin for Dorian calendars since it is the commonest month of all, and since Plutarch, a calendar expert, equates it as a general rule with Athens’ *Metageitniûn* = August (Nic. 28.2).¹⁴ Accordingly, *Malophorios* = *Skiophoriôn* = June. A festival that gives its name to June cannot celebrate the harvesting of apples or quinces.

Pausanias, in remarking the cult at Megara, makes it a question what *malophoros* can possibly mean (1.44.3). Various explanations were given, he says, among them that the first inhabitants reared “sheep,” i.e. the old word *μῆλον*. Pausanias draws on learned antiquarian literature in which the meaning of *malophoros* was debated, inconclusively as we see. Very likely it was pointed out that the Doric word for “sheep” is not *μᾶλον* but *μεῖλον*, the triumphant objection of modern scholars who embrace apple or quince. But if apple or quince, why was this not obvious to Pausanias and his source? Pausanias shows us that the goddess did *not* carry apple or quince.¹⁵ He shows us that the *μᾶλον* of *μαλοφόρος* had a meaning that was no longer understood.

An old compound *μῆλοψ* “*μῆλον*-looking,” ending in *-οψ* instead of the later *-ωψ* or *-ωπος*, survives only in the formular line (*αἱ μῆν*) *ἀλετρεύουσι μύλης ἐπὶ μῆλοπα καρπὸν* “(women) grind the *mêlon*-looking grain at the mill” (Od. 7.104, [Hes.] fr. 337). *μῆλον* is here a color word, like *σῆνος* in *σῆνοψ*. Any modern commentary will remind us that grain is yellow or golden; it is the color of a quince or a tawny apple. Grain is yellow, yes, when it stands in the field or lies in sheaves but not when it is brought to the mill. Some ancient critics felt the difficulty of likening grain at the mill to apples or quinces and chose to render the line as “women tease the sheep-looking produce on the kneecap,” i.e. card or spin wool while sitting.¹⁶ They show us that *μῆλοψ* too had a meaning that was no longer understood.¹⁷

Grain brought to the mill, grain threshed and winnowed, is

conspicuously white. Both wheat and barley are called “white” in the formulas *κρί λευκόν* and *λεύκ ἄλφιτα*. Winnowing transforms “golden” Demeter, *ξανθή*, into “white” heaps, *ὑπολευγκαίνονται* (*Il.* 5.499–502). The west or northwest wind that winnows and causes threshing floors to be sited on a west slope is called *Ἀργέστης* “Whitener.” As processioners bring baskets of winnowed grain from the country to the city center, the community rejoices that another year is “white,” *λευκὸν ἔαρ, λευκὸν δὲ θέρος* κτλ (Callim. *H. Cer.* 122–23). The color of *μήλον* is therefore white, not yellow; it is the flesh, not the skin.

In the compound *μαλοφόρος* the first element is the color “apple,” not the fruit. The “apple-bearer” carries something conspicuously white, which in the worship of Demeter and in the month of June can only be the newly winnowed grain. Although the meaning of *malophoros* was finally forgotten at Megara—and Pausanias reminds us that the city was in a sorry state for a long time before his visit (1.36.3)—we might expect it to be well remembered as long as any of the cities in question kept up the old ways. If it was, it provides a sorely needed explanation for the words *μαλοπάρανος* and *μαλός* boldly displayed in two hyper-Doric poems of Theocritus (*Id.* 26.1, *Ep.* 1. 5).¹⁸ The first means in effect “white-cheeked,” just as our compound means in effect “white-bearer.” The second is either an adjective or a noun meaning “the white one,” being applied to a sacrificial he-goat.

On *Gaggera* then Demeter was named, and her sanctuary served, for a great festival that marked the winnowing of the grain, which is the completion of the harvest and the final labor of the grain cycle. This public event agrees with the personal dedication of Theýllus son of Pyrrhias already mentioned.

Zeus *milichios* in the adjoining precinct has very modest accommodation compared with Demeter. He is not honored with a festival but with private offerings that are brought from day to day over a period of time, as wheat and barley ripen in each field throughout the territory of Selinus.

Harvest Rites in Western Athens

Selinus inherited the cults of Zeus *milichios* and Demeter from Megara, no doubt by way of Megara Hyblaea. They were evidently common to Megara and her colonies. We are bound to suspect that such harvest celebrations were a widespread pattern, like the anxious rites of early spring. Again, we must go to Athens in search of evidence denied us elsewhere. Athens has a pair of shrines on a western hill that belong to Zeus *milichios* and to local Nymphs (not Demeter) and are likewise set apart for harvest celebrations. Zeus *milichios* is visited privately, and

the Nymphs are the object of a grand procession. The two observances are referred to by a locative term, *Δημῖαισι* “at dêmosrites,” which is rather like “in the land of *Euthydamos*.”

At Athens as at Selinus there are contrasting areas on opposite sides of the city. Let us recall the setting of Athens’ rites of spring (chapters 8–9). The spring festival of Zeus *milichios* takes place in the district *Agra*, which lies outside the city at the southeast, beyond the Ilissus. It is important to remember that the original city was no more than the Acropolis and a lower settlement to the south, a small area permanently visible as a concentration of early shrines. When the community began to increase in numbers by recruiting fictitious kinsmen farther off in Attica, a central agora or muster ground was marked out for the warrior “brothers.” Yet this *old* agora, as it is called by contrast with the Classical Agora, was still at the heart of the original area, on somewhat sloping ground at the southeast foot of the Acropolis.¹⁹ Thucydides describes the early city just so, insisting that even in his day most Athenians felt rooted in the far-flung Attic countryside.²⁰

Almost everything else within the great Themistoclean wall is later. A considerable area west of the Acropolis had its use, but not for habitation.²¹ It is the area bounded by the Areopagus and Colonus hills and the stream Eridanus, in early days occupied by extensive cemeteries and by potters with their unpleasant industrial activity.²² Over a long period, cemeteries sometimes alternated with potters’ workshops. This picture of western Athens has now been firmly demonstrated, and earlier misconceptions of “villages” all round the Acropolis can be set aside. Both burials and wells used to be taken as evidence of habitation, refuting Thucydides or convicting him of false emphasis—as if he and his Athenian readers, unlike the inhabitants of any other European city, had no authentic recollection of change.

As in *Agra*, so in western Athens we find a few old cults that were placed apart from the settlement for some special purpose.²³ Two of them, on the Hill of the Nymphs, match our two cults on *Gaggera*. The hill takes its modern name from a cult of Nymphs on the summit; the ancient name, likewise bound up with these Nymphs, is *Hyakinthos*. They are approached at the time of Athens’ *Skiophoria*, a harvest festival like the *Malophoria*, though it is unique to Athens and honors Athena and Poseidon rather than Demeter. Zeus *milichios* has a much larger sanctuary on the northeast spur of the hill and is worshipped privately at the same season. The locative term that embraces both observances is *Δημῖαισι* “at dêmos-rites.” We shall take these items in the above order of mention: the Nymphs, Zeus *milichios*, the locative term.

The Nymphs of the Hill *Hyakinthos*

The Nymphs are known as such only from a rock-cult inscription on the highest slope, just above the church of Ayia Marina: *ἡιεαρόν Νυμφ[ῶ]ν δέμο* “shrine of the Nymphs of the *demos*,” s. V *med.* (*IG* i³ i 065). The last word appears to be a descriptive genitive that signals the role of the Nymphs in civic ritual.²⁴ It is similar to the locative term. Until lately, no other material was reported at the site. But recent cleaning has uncovered “a large number of figurines, mainly of the Archaic period;” further details are awaited.²⁵ The shrine of the Nymphs is also the likely source of a votive relief found on the north slope of the Areopagus (Agora I 7154, c. 330 B.C.).²⁶ Depicting the Nymphs on a mythical occasion, it was dedicated by Neoptolemus, a rich and prominent demesman of Melite in the later fourth century, whose munificence extended also to the shrine of Artemis *aristobulê*, close by the Hill of the Nymphs on the north.²⁷ Hermes presents the babe Dionysus to three Nymphs while other deities look on. Right in front of Hermes and the Nymphs is a rough-hewn altar, and the background and the frame indicate a rocky grotto: the scene takes place at a shrine. Now the original church of Ayia Marina was itself within a natural cave existing still. The cave may have been converted to a cistern in late antiquity; at the present day it serves as a baptistery within a church much enlarged.²⁸ The paucity of material is compensated by an abiding spiritual presence.

This striking cult site is not unknown to literature. Euripides in his play *Erechtheus* associates the proud old story with another cult besides that of Erechtheus on the Acropolis—with a cult that commemorates the three martyred daughters of the king. They will be honored henceforth, says Athena *ex machina*, under the title *Hyakinthides* (fr. 370 line 74 Kannicht). The title is conferred because the girls were sacrificed “on the hill called *Hyakinthos*,” as we learn from Phanodemus (*FGrH* 325 F 4 = *Erechtheus* test. vib Kannicht).²⁹ Now the story of Erechtheus is mostly an *aition* of the festival *Skirophoria*, in which the Acropolis priests of Athena and Poseidon parade to Scirum in the plowland west of Athens for a ritual that marks the end of the threshing.³⁰ The priests are descended from Erechtheus and his queen, and the threshing is a virtual battle (the actual battle is avowedly situated at Scirum). But the preliminary sacrifice of Erechtheus’ daughters explains a preliminary rite at the western edge of the city, before Erechtheus goes forth to battle, before the priests parade to Scirum. The only cult site that qualifies is that of the Nymphs on the Hill of the Nymphs. This is the hill *Hyakinthos*, and these are the *Hyakinthides*. The shrine is called *Hyakinthion* in a list of shrines and monuments restored in the early Roman period (*IG* 2²

1035 line 52); its place in the list points to western Athens.³¹ What flower is meant by “hyacinth” we do not know, but the name typifies the season.³²

In *Erechtheus*, Athena speaks at some length of the commemorative offerings that the *Hyakinthides* will receive (fr. 370 lines 75–89). She points to the place where we see “the gladness of the hyacinth”—these lines are fragmentary—and says, “I command my townsmen (τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἀστοῖς) to honor them faithfully with annual sacrifices and with the blood-letting of slaughtered oxen, adorning it with the sacred dances of maidens.” Next she prescribes an exceptional rite, a libation of honey only, not wine, to be performed if an enemy approaches the city.³³ Finally, she commands that the very shrine shall be an *abaton* difficult of access—for the enemy must not be able to slip in so as to make an offering that would gain favor. It is evident that the shrine high on the slope of the hill, the *abaton*, could not in fact accommodate the sacrifice of oxen and the dancing of maidens; oxen and maidens could hardly even reach it. For such activities the only possible setting is at the foot of the hill. Athena’s dispositions explain why the worship is thus divided between the shrine at the summit and the level ground below. After this account of the *Hyakinthides*, Athena proceeds to the shrine and ritual of Erechtheus on the Acropolis (lines 90–97).

It is also noteworthy that at the last, as Athena tells how Eumolpus too will be commemorated by the ritual of Eleusinian Demeter (lines 97–114), she somehow, in very broken lines, confers the very similar title *Hyades* on Erechtheus’ daughters (lines 107–8).³⁴ The constellation *Hyades* is most often identified with three Nymphs who nurse Dionysus.³⁵ As we saw, the votive relief assignable to our shrine shows the infant Dionysus being presented to three Nymphs. It is impossible to say whether the *Hyakinthides* were so regarded only because of the like-sounding titles or because of some observance at another season.³⁶

Yet another aetiology can be discerned in [Apollodorus] (*Bibl.* 3.15.8.3–4 [3.212]). When Athens was at war with Minos, the daughters of one Hyacinthus were sacrificed “at the grave of *Geraistos* the Cyclops.”³⁷ Hyacinthus is said to be a Laconian living at Athens, an obvious tribute to the famous Hyacinthus and *Hyakinthia* of Amyclae, but his daughters are more truly *Hyakinthides* of Athens, with individual names suited to the season and the ritual.³⁸ The name *Geraistos* and the species Cyclops are both redolent of storm; they personify the threat of bad weather, like the Thracian allies of Eleusis, like Poseidon and his trident stroke. So the shrine of the Nymphs has at least three competing aetiologies.

We turn from literature to a document that has just come to light,

another fragment of Athens' compendious calendar of sacrifice in the years round 400 B.c. (Agora I 7577).³⁹ The stone is inscribed on both sides, with passages of both the earlier calendar in Attic letters and the later in Ionic letters. The passage in Attic letters is a column of nineteen badly broken lines pertaining to a month that does not appear. Offerings are prescribed to Heracles, *Herôes*, *Tritopatreis*, and *Hyakinthides*. Halfway through the preserved entries, at line 11, we come to the heading "on the ninth," which applies to all that follow, a second offering to Heracles and offerings to *Tritopatreis* and *Hyakinthides*. Heracles is worshipped mainly in spring and summer. *Tritopatreis*, as we have learned, belong to the harvest season, either as the grain is ripening (*Munichiôn*, *Thargêliôn*) or as it is gathered (*Skirophorion*).

The entry for *Hyakinthides* is the last that can be recognized. In line 16 there is the name *Hyakinthides* in the dative, and in line 17 the term *καθαρῆ[όν]* "purification." It is the same occasion as in Euripides. Since the occasion is preliminary to the festival *Skirophoria*, the month is *Skirophorion*. The date of the festival *Skirophoria* is the twelfth; the ninth does nicely for a preliminary rite.

We should also take account of the two lines preceding (14–15), between the offerings to both Heracles and *Tritopatreis* and those to *Hyakinthides*, and of the line following (18). In line 14 the sum of twenty-six drachmas is inscribed before the word *παγκοι[*, where the only likely restoration is *πάγκοι[να* or *παγκοίν[ως* "all in common," and in line 15 the sum of three drachmas is inscribed before "priestly perquisites."⁴⁰ Since no amount is inscribed before the name *Hyakinthides*, the previous lines will refer to them. Before "purification" an amount may or may not have been inscribed; in any case, this is likely to be the separate rite in the *abaton*. In line 18 comes the phrase *ἐν ἄστει* "in the town," as it must be.⁴¹ Two lines more in the column are illegible. The indications of the calendar agree strikingly with Euripides. He describes a large public celebration, and Athena enjoins it upon the "townsmen." We have also noted the rock-cut inscription "shrine of the Nymphs of the *dêmos*," and we shall come to the locative term "at *dêmos*-rites."

In sum, this observance on the hill *Hyakinthos*, preliminary to the festival *Skirophoria*, may be compared with Selinus' festival *Malophoria*. The *Skirophoria* itself, as a procession from the Acropolis to the place Scirum beside the Cephissus, was created so as to advertise Athenian agriculture at a time when Eleusis was still independent. It is a civic counterpart of the primary festival *Skira* celebrated in the demes—which belongs to Demeter alone. The *Skirophoria* procession, as was said, honors Athena and Poseidon, and Demeter is not mentioned.⁴² Yet Demeter had a shrine beside the Cephissus, and Zeus

milichios an altar on the opposite bank, both very close to the plowland called Scirum; both were in the hands of the priestly clan Phyalidae, who have a striking role in the Theseus story, as the hero first arrives at Athens and again as his father Aegeus is laid to rest.⁴³ Very likely these cults of Demeter and Zeus *milichios* were associated with the *Skrophoria* procession—but to conjecture how would take us much too far, with no certain result.

The σκῖρα (neut. pl.) of the festival names are in effect the “white” milled grain.⁴⁴ The ordinary words σκῖρος, σκίρός, σκίρόομαι, σκιραίνω, σκιρώδης mostly convey the notion “hard,” like the much commoner σκληρός, which doubtless worked on σκίρ- by analogy. σκῖρος, however, also refers to either chalk land or gypsum; σκίρρα and σκίρρος are so defined in the Suda. This narrower meaning is likely to be the original one; hardness is suggested by chalk or gypsum, but not the reverse. The narrower meaning was always there; scholiasts contriving explanations for *Skrophoria* speak of a white sunshade or a gypsum statue.⁴⁵ The winnowed grain was called “chalk” just as it was called “apple,” so as to conjure it into being.⁴⁶

Zeus *Milichios* on the Hill *Hyakinthos*

Athens has not the custom of aniconic *milichios* stones, though they occur nearby at Megara and in Boeotia. Instead, Zeus *milichios* receives many private dedications in the city and in Peiraeus, dating from the late fourth to the first centuries B.C., which are typically reliefs representing the god as either a bearded figure seated on a throne, holding phiale and scepter, or more often as a rearing bearded snake.⁴⁷ Sometimes he is approached by a family group variously rendered, with women and girls just as prominent as men and boys.⁴⁸ Sometimes the inscription names a woman alone as the dedicator. Once a pig appears as sacrificial victim (a ram or a lamb appears in other reliefs that might equally belong to Zeus *philios* or even Asclepius).⁴⁹ But the worship so finely depicted will be far more ancient than the votive fashion that brings it to our notice. And no doubt it was transplanted from the city to Peiraeus when the port was laid out in the fifth century.

The Peiraeus dedications all come from a single shrine on a rocky slope beside the sea, where the shoreline forms an inlet between the harbors of Zea and Munichia.⁵⁰ At Athens, too, we look for a common source. It is plainly not the festival site at Agrae; these private dedications have nothing to do with the festival business of early spring. The findspots are concentrated, with few exceptions, at two points on the west side of the city—the Agora and the Hill of the Nymphs, alias *Hyakinthos*.⁵¹ The battered remnants in the Agora

belong to the extraneous material that was mostly brought from uninhabited areas to the west, right down to the nineteenth century: in this case, maybe from the Hill of the Nymphs. Now at the Hill of the Nymphs the northeast spur is a plateau of bare rock marked at the upper end by a pair of rock-cut inscriptions, *ῥόρος Διός* and *ῥόρος* only. The whole area has been carefully investigated by G. V. Lalonde. He distinguishes a sacrificial area, a lustral basin, a platform for votive offerings, and the outline of assorted small buildings and other structures.⁵² From the provenance of our inscriptions he makes out a strong case for Zeus *milichios*.

There are nine inscribed dedications at Athens, seven at Peiraeus. All save one are addressed to Zeus *milichios* alone. A base found long ago at the Hill of the Nymphs is inscribed, on behalf of a female dedicator, “to Helios and to Zeus *meilichios*, Mammia.”⁵³ It is evident that Helios is worshipped close by. This latecomer among the gods was no doubt installed on the Hill of the Nymphs as a good place for observation of the sky; the summit is occupied by the Old Observatory of 1852. Helios will be most entreated round the same time as Zeus *milichios*, since bright skies are needed for the harvest. So it is that the priest of Helios takes his place in the *Skirophoria* procession beside the Acropolis priesthoods of Athena and Poseidon.⁵⁴

The *Dēmiasi* Gate

The city gate so called is known only from Hesychius s. *Δημίασι*. He treats the name as an enigma, reciting two far-fetched explanations, namely that it somehow refers to prostitutes who stood there, or that it is equivalent to *Διομηῖσι*, the name of quite another gate.⁵⁵ The modern explanation that has superseded them is no better, namely that it somehow refers to *ὁ δήμιος* “the public executioner.” An area north of the Hill of the Nymphs, outside the city wall, is plausibly identified as the area where executioners cast out bodies and tainted articles; wheel ruts approaching the wall have been observed hereabouts; so scholars since Judeich agree on this location for Hesychius’ gate.⁵⁶

Yet *Δημίασι* is in truth the old locative case of either a feminine or a neuter plural. What other word can it be but *Δήμια* “*dēmos-rites*”? The form *Δημίασι* “at *dēmos-rites*” matches **Δίασι* “at Zeus-rites” on the other side of the city. It is true that the original reason for locating Hesychius’ gate has disappeared together with the public executioner. But there *was* a gate just here, witness the wheel ruts, and no other name is available. The name as we understand it now fits perfectly. The road through the gate has not been traced inside the wall; yet it passed close to the Hill of the Nymphs and its northeast spur before it

joined the main road leading from the Peiraeus gate; this in turn ran past the shrine of Artemis *aristobule* to the large intersection at the southwest corner of the Agora.⁵⁷ So before our road issued at the *Dêmias* gate, it brought worshippers from the rest of the city to both the *Hyakinthides* and Zeus *milichios*. It brought a procession that included sacrificial oxen and choruses of maidens to a shrine that is labeled “of the *dêmos*.” The area of the two shrines may well be called *Dêmias*, just as a similar area at Selinus is said to be “in the land of *Euthydamos*.”

1. JJK 52–53, 97, 121 think of *Euthydamos*, like *Myskos*, as a person of note in Selinus’ early days, perhaps even an unrecorded founder, whose descendants maintained a commemorative cult at a *milichios* stone and were perhaps now stained by homicide pollution. Against this, see chapter 8, pp. 130–31.

2. A temple farther south probably belongs to Hera, and another much farther north to Heracles. There is no reason to associate either of these with the harvest season or “the land of *Euthydamos*.”

3. The *diêgêsis* takes it as a name, and modern commentators likewise, but they both miss a good deal of irony in the poem, and the word seems to be used allusively, “as if.”

4. A substantial wall a little farther south was long thought to be the perimeter wall but is now recognized as the north wall of Hera’s precinct (if it is she), with its own early temple: Parisi Presicce (1984, 21–22).

5. The figurines have been published lately by Dewailly (1992), Corinthian pottery by Dehl-von Kaenen (1995); both go back to the earliest days of Selinus.

6. Miles (1998b).

7. White (1967, 343–52), Holloway (1991, 62). JJK 133 do not address the point.

8. White (1967, 336–41).

9. See Robertson (1996d, 374–79; 1998c, 568–72; 1999b, 25–30).

10. The last two lines were so read by Wilamowitz (1930, 258) from Gabrici’s photograph. Citing Hsch. *ἐμπέλανα· πόπανα*, he thought the offering was a mere cake, and objection has been rightly taken, as by Zuntz (1971, 98n3). Yet the two words seem natural in this context, and a better meaning can be suggested. Jameson (1956, 59–60) renders “a votive for the *pelanos*” and thinks of a votive object serving as a fee or contribution. Rather, “a votive for harvest offerings,” i.e. the fulfillment of a vow to make harvest offerings. Hesychius s. *πελάνα* offers *inter alia* *τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ἄλῳ ἀπάργματα* (Schmidt *πράγματα* mss.) “the firstlings from the threshing floor”; in the Eleusinian first-fruits decrees “the *pepeanos*” is the sum of such firstlings, whether it is their value or an actual mass of flour or gruel (IG 1³ 78.36, 2² 140.18–19). Admittedly, the Selinus inscription has been the subject of extensive comment, traceable through SEG 50.994. There is no agreement on possible readings; there are dramatic reversals of

opinion. Proposed alternatives are *πυρὰν vel ἐϋραν vel ἑϋραν*, and *ἐν πελά-/γει* —all, so far as intelligible, remote from Demeter’s usual concerns.

11. See Hanell (1934, 174–81).

12. The word is also used, when qualified or in a given context, for many other

tree fruits, but none of them could be intended in these customary words. According to Trümper (1997, 130), the month *Malophorios* “doubtless has to do with the apple harvest beginning in autumn.” She equates *Malophorios* with July instead of June (cf. note 14), but it is still a long wait until autumn.

13. Hanell (1934, 50–54) surveys Demeter’s cult at Megara. Lauffer (1980) establishes the original sense of *μεγαρσν*, always the same word, as “inner chamber,” whence sacrificial pits, whence the city name.

14. Trümper (1997, 129–30, 147–55) cites and interprets the evidence. In her scheme, which is not the usual one, *Karneios* = *Boedromion* = September and *Malophorios* = *Hekatombaiôn* = July. She holds that in 415 b.c., when Plutarch provides a date in *Karneios* = *Metageitnion*, the calendar must have been disturbed by intercalation. But this is not an equation for the very year 415, which would be unrecorded and of no conceivable interest. Rather, Plutarch identifies the normal position of the Dorian month for the common reader, who knows only the Athenian calendar.

15. It is remarkable—until we remember Wilamowitz’s poor opinion of Pausanias—that Wilamowitz (1931, 108n1) confidently speaks of the “apple bearer” and of a cult statue at Megara showing such a figure, “which we can well imagine in light of the many apple-bearing goddesses among the terracottas.” This is to say either that Pausanias never visited Megara or that he kept his eyes closed while he was there.

16. It has also been suggested that the line was reinterpreted at an early date to make a riddle in the *Wedding of Ceyx*: Merkelbach and West (1967, 314–15).

17. The color *οἶνος*, though it varies as red wine does, is opposed to the color of white wine, *κυρρός*: Schultz (1904, 39, 41–4); cf. English “wine.” The color *μῆλον* was likewise restricted.

18. Gow on *Id.* 26.1 cites other occurrences of *maloparaus*, including Hesychius’ gloss (= “white-cheeked”) and also his gloss *μάλουρος* (= “white-tailed”).

19. See Robertson (1986, 157–68; 1992, 43–54; 1998a).

20. Thucydides’ account is often misunderstood, even by Parker (1996, 8–9, 343 add.; 2005c, 55III8). Thucydides does not uphold, he opposes, the conception of “synoecism” as a movement of people into the city. On these matters Gomme’s excellent commentary offers no help at all; writing fifty years ago, he was concerned to debate and decide controversies now extinct.

21. The Areopagus itself, Athens’ most prominent feature next to the Acropolis, was distinctly outside the settlement, occupied in imagination by invading Amazons.

22. Papadopoulos (1996; 2003, 1–6, 271–97).

ἐφ’ Ἱππολύτῳ

23. The early cult of Aphrodite *ἵππο* “at Horse-unbridling” was probably on the northwest side of Colonus-by-the-Agora: Robertson (2005, 85–104).

24. The purport of the word has been much debated lately: see *SEG* 50.87 and Lalonde (2006a, 96; 2006b, 110).

25. See *BCH* 127 (2003) 695–96, a report of work carried out by P. Lazzaridis and O. Voghiatzoglou.

26. The Cave of Pan on the Acropolis was suggested by T. L. Shear Jr.; Wycherley (1978, 178) pointed to the Hill of the Nymphs as an alternative.

27. For Neoptolemus of Melite, see Davies (1971, 399–400); for Artemis *aristobule*, Parker (1996, 155).

28. The church of Ayia Marina is discussed at length by Lalonde (2005); figure

4 is a photograph of the cave as baptistery. Lalonde sets himself against any notion of continuity from pagan to Christian worship, but in such a matter there cannot be disproof.

29. Phanodemus also locates the hill *ὑπὲρ τῶν Σφενδονίων* “above the ?Sling-stones”, a place name otherwise unknown. The Hill of the Nymphs is in fact “above” the desolate rocky area just outside the Themistoclean wall where public executioners cast out the bodies of their victims and also the clothes and nooses of suicides (Pl. *Resp.* 4, 439e, Plut. *Them.* 22.2). Perhaps it was called “Sling-stones.” Leontius in Plato cannot refrain from gaping at the horrors; others may have made a game of it.

30. See Robertson (1996c, 28–29, 43–44, 52–56; 2004, 121–22; 2005, 65–68).

31. Culley (1977, 286n14) accepts this location as probable.

32. Theophrastus reckons *hyakinthos*, both wild and cultivated, among plants that flower in spring (*Hist. Pl.* 6.8.2). The flowers so called, certainly more than one, were also typical of hills and mountains. See Gow on Theocr. *Id.* 10.28, Richardson on *H. Cer.* 7.

33. What is the actual rite that inspires the notion offending off an enemy? The danger that will ruin the crop just at harvest time is rain; it is implicit in the looming threat of Eleusis’ Thracian allies and their patron deity, Poseidon (in the event, he thunderbolts Erechtheus only when the battle has been won, only when the grain has been harvested). If then rain is feared, the Nymphs are supplicated accordingly. They are also identified, as we are about to see, with the constellation *Hyades*, notorious for bringing rain, and the cult site is also identified with the grave of one *Geraistos*, a name evoking storm.

34. That it is the constellation is shown by line 108, and that Erechtheus’ daughters are in view is confirmed by schol. Arat. *Phaen.* 172, who also records an appearance of the three *Hyades* in Euripides’ *Phaethon* (fr. 783b Kannicht).

35. See W. Gundel, *RE* 8.2 (1913) 2620–21 s. *Hyades*.

36. Dionysus has a life story, as fetus, infant, boy, lad, and man, that corresponds to the growth and production cycle of vine, grape, and wine. The nursing infant belongs to spring. Rain is wanted then to foster the vine, and the same Nymphs might well have power to mend the weather either way, at different seasons. Yet it would be surprising that a secondary title, *Hyades*, should just happen to agree so closely with their primary title as denizens of the hill *Hyakinthos*.

37. The likeness of these two stories of self-sacrificing daughters, those of Erechtheus and those of Hyacinthus, is generally recognized but explained in various ways: see e.g. Kearns (1989, 59–63, 201–2).

38. *Antheis* “Flowery,” *Aigleis* “Bright,” *Lytaia* “Redeeming” (*lytaios* is also an epithet of Poseidon), *Orthaia* “Steep” (evoking the hilltop).

39. Discovered in 1993, the fragment is published with a helpful commentary by Gawlinski (2007).

40. Gawlinski (2007, 52) entertains *Παγκοί[ράνοι]* as a possible epithet and *πάγκοι[νος ΟΓ παγκοί[της]* as adjectives.

41. Gawlinski (2007, 53) thinks of either *ναστος* “cake” or *ἐ]ν ᾧ σ[τει]* but resists the latter, partly on the ground that it “does not fit the pattern of indentation.” Yet as she further says, it is hard to make out the pattern; nor need it apply to these words.

42. We owe our knowledge of the procession chiefly to Lysimachides *FGrH* 366 (note 54, this chapter). In very derivative lexicons and scholia it is disputed whether the festival belongs to Athena or Demeter and whether the true name is *Skirphoria* or *Skira*, but this is mainly or entirely due to confusion between the different

festivals of the city and of the demes.

43. Plut. *Thes.* 12.1, 23.5, Paus. 1.37.2, 4. The eponym Phytalus, says Pausanias, received Demeter in his house, a story that must once have wounded the ears of Eleusis. It is rendered innocuous by the late epigram that Pausanias reads off from “the tomb of Phytalus,” reporting that her gift to him was not what we expect but the fig. We should not postulate a cathartic use of figs and ascribe this ritual to the Phytalidae (so Toepffer [1889, 247–50]). Dried figs, with their high sugar content, are a staple sweetener of pastry; they go with Demeter’s principal gift, the grain harvest. We happen to be told that a fig pastry called *hêgetêria* was carried in a much lesser procession at a slightly earlier festival, the *Plyntêria* (Phot. s.v.); its principal use may have been at the *Skirophoria*.

44. The very name *Skirophoria* shows that the processioners returned to the Acropolis bearing winnowed grain, *skira*, from Scirum; no doubt it was milled by the ten-year-old servitors of Athena called *aletris* (Ar. *Lys.* 644).

45. “The priest of Erechtheus carries a white *skiadeion*, which is called *skiron*”: schol. Ar. *Eccl.* 18. Other sources make it just a *skiadeion*. Theseus “was holding up an Athena he made out of gypsum”: schol. Paus. 1.1.4.

46. The wind called *Σκίρων* in Attica was generally known as *Ἀργέστης* “Whitener,” doubtless for its effect in winnowing the grain. But the Attic name must be secondary, based on the ritual use of the *skir*- words. It does not show that *σκιρος* meant literally “white.”

47. Athens: Cook (1925, 1114–19), JJK 82, Lalonde (2006a, 103–8, 111–12, 119–20). Peiraeus: Cook (1925, 1104–10), Garland (1987, 238–39), JJK 82–83, Lalonde (2006a, 114–17).

48. Parker (2005c, 37–49) includes these reliefs and inscriptions in his illuminating survey of family religion.

49. Pig: Peiraeus Museum no. 3, *IG* 2² 4569. Ram: NM 1408, 1433. Lamb: NM 1407.

50. The rock-cut niches where the votives were displayed are indicated on plan III of Judeich (1931), a map of Peiraeus.

51. Lalonde (2006a, 42–44).

52. Lalonde (2006a, i-39).

53. *IG* 2² 4678; cf. Lalonde (2006a, 82–86, 104, and fig. 26).

54. Lysimachides *FGrH* 366, our source for the three consorting priesthoods, is conjecturally dated by Jacoby “between 50^a and 50^p.”

55. The name is said to mean *κοινῆς* “common” with reference to prostitutes, and in consequence, it is also said, some assign the gate to the Cerameicus as a notorious haunt of prostitutes. Those who did so had no idea where the gate actually was, since the Cerameicus thus regarded has only the Sacred Gate and the Dipylon.

56. Judeich (1931, 140, 186), Travlos (1971, 121, 159, 168–69), Stroud (1998, 105), Lalonde (2006b, 114–16).

57. Stroud (1998, 104–7) discusses the course of this main road as the likely route for the conveyance of grain from Peiraeus to the Agora.

Hospitality for an *Elasteros*

Synopsis

Column B, lines 1–13:

If a person wishes to be purified of an *elasteros* by slaying with his own hand, he shall announce wherever he wishes and whenever in the year he wishes and in whatever month he wishes and on whatever day he wishes, and shall announce in whatever direction he wishes, and shall set about being purified. And he shall entertain to a meal, and provide washing and supping and salt for this same one. And he shall sacrifice a piglet to Zeus, and shall go forth from there, and shall turn his back, and shall converse, and shall take food, and shall sleep wherever he wishes. If someone wishes to be purified of an *elasteros* that is entertained, or ancestral, or heard, or seen, or whomsoever, he shall be purified in the same way.

[The last five lines are inscribed in larger letters.] ...as the one slaying with his own hand. After one has been purified of an *elasteros*, he shall sacrifice a full-grown victim on the public altar, and shall be pure. He shall mark a boundary with salt, and sprinkle round with a gold vessel, and go away. Whenever one needs to sacrifice for the *elasteros*, sacrifice just as to the immortals. But one shall slay the animal with the blood running down to earth.

The whole of column B sets forth the steps one must take to be purified of a frightening power called *elasteros*. The procedure is here devised for the first time. It necessarily consists of ritual actions known otherwise, but they do not suffice to identify the power. The word *elasteros* will serve to do so, when we consider its occurrence elsewhere as an epithet of Zeus ([chapter 15](#)). Though the usual opinion makes it a returning ghost or an avenging spirit, most of the ritual actions are not conformable, still less the undoubted function of Zeus *elasteros*.

The first and longer part describes a very modest version of table hospitality, descending even to words and gestures. The animal victim that supplies the meat is the least possible, a piglet. It is sacrificed to Zeus as a high god who is related. The host demonstrates his solicitude by slaying the animal with his own hand, an unusual

punctilio in the light of normal Greek sacrifice. It is the meaning of a term twice repeated, *autorektas*. At the end we are assured that this rite of table hospitality is suited to an *elasteros* of any kind whatsoever, the different kinds being indicated somewhat awkwardly.

The second part was added as an afterthought. An additional measure that caters rather to the well-to-do is to sacrifice a larger victim at Zeus' public altar, again with expressive actions. It is further said that the sacrifice must be conducted in a certain way when it is meant for the benefit of an *elasteros*. It must be conducted as if it honored both a power above and a power below.

Problems in Column B

Whereas column A gives a series of directives for sacrificing to several deities, column B, which is about half as long, gives one directive only, for being purified of a being called *elasteros*. The term *autorektas* "slaying with one's own hand" is applied to the person being purified. The first part of it, lines 1–8, is straightforward. The ritual for being purified consists of (1) a formal announcement, (2) a hospitable meal—whether it is enjoyed by the *elasteros*, or by the person being purified, turns on the suppletion of a lacuna—(3) a modest sacrifice to Zeus, (4) a leave-taking with expressive actions. After this, the *elasteros* himself is fully specified, with the assurance that the foregoing ritual always applies. The shorter second part, lines 9–13, is a professed supplement. A larger sacrifice "on the public altar," an altar that is selfevident, reinforces the purification; it even has another leave-taking, a more stylish one. Finally, the *elasteros* himself may receive sacrifice in a certain mode with emphatic labels. For the rule-makers at Selinus, both the scope of an *elasteros* and the appropriate rites seem to be in process of definition.

The long inscription of Cyrene, c. 335–324 B.C., offers certain parallels real or apparent in its very last rule. A term fully equivalent to *autorektas*, *autophonos* "slaying with one's own hand," is attached to the person being purified. The prescribed ritual consists of (1) a formal announcement, (2) a hospitable reception of the person being purified, though without a meal, (3) the attendance of persons summoned by the announcement, (4) sacrifice at a public shrine—and here the text breaks off. Instead of an *elasteros*, the word *hikesioi* is understood to denote the fearsome beings from whom one is purified—but not only in the last rule, rather in the last group of three rules, each diverse and curious.

On the interpretation of column B that has prevailed since JJK argued it at length, an *elasteros* is either an angry ghost or an avenging power—the *hikesioi* of Cyrene had already been so regarded, with the

literal meaning “visitants.”¹ The *autorektas* (or again the *autophonos*) is a homicide, a manslayer. To be purified of an *elasteros* is to be purified of homicide pollution—the different kinds of *elasteros* correspond to the different ways in which homicide pollution may be recognized or acquired. Obviously, much depends on those two words. In [chapter 15](#) it will be argued that the *elasteros* is a frightening power of nature, itself conceived as a pollution. At the end of this chapter it is argued that the person being purified is called *autorektas* (or again *autophonos*) by reason of slaying a sacrificial victim with his own hand, an unusual requirement.

That group of rules at Cyrene must be studied separately (chapter 22). The discussion here only alludes to them. But it should be said forthwith that we shall look in vain for any counterpart of the *elasteros*. All three rules concern “suppliants,” who are known everywhere either by the noun *hiketês* or by the adjective *hikesios*—these words have no other meaning. The last rule of all at Cyrene is close to a standard form of purification that was undoubtedly familiar at Selinus too. Hence the similarities, of no particular consequence.

Before we come to the term *autorektas*, it is essential to establish what was done in the ritual. The announcement, the hospitable meal, the sacrifice, the expressive actions, all have been variously conceived and explained. So have the different kinds of *elasteros*. So has the business of the supplement, which indeed is not recognized as such. However conceived or explained, everything is thought to point to homicide pollution. But we must wrench our minds away from murder.

The Announcement

The person being purified first announces “where”, and just “when” (season, month, day), and also *hóπνι* “whither,” a further point expressly added to the rest. That is to say, he announces “where” and “when” he will perform the ritual. It seems unlikely that “whither” only repeats “where,” as if from the point of view of one summoned thither. Instead, “whither” must be the direction in which the ritual will take effect—the quarter where the threat lies, where an *elasteros* may have been either “heard” or “seen” (as he is said to be in line 7). Who then is summoned by the announcement? Surely it is the *elasteros*.² If it were people at large, anyone potentially interested in attending or in simply knowing that the thing is done, the place for making the announcement would be critical and would be mentioned first. No doubt we might suppose that the place was obvious—that it was the very setting where we read the tablet and where we see “the public altar,” arguably the agora. There is still a clear indication that

the *elasteros* is addressed. In the next line the hospitable meal is duly offered “to the same one,” i.e. to the *elasteros*. Accordingly, the so-called announcement is more properly an invocation of the *elasteros*, bidding him enjoy a hospitable meal.

It is by design that the instruction has been framed in the punctilious language of an official announcement: it sounds all the more authoritative. Some other announcements have been compared, as if they were to like effect. Yet the similarities of phrase or even of substance have no real significance. Homicide proceedings at Athens, as codified by Draco, open with an announcement, *προειπεῖν*, by the relatives of the victim: they go to the agora and publicly name the killer.³ It is a practical step involving no ritual or higher power. At Cyrene the final rule includes an announcement, *καταγγέλλει* [ι, *προαγγελετῇ*][ρα, summoning people to witness the purification.⁴ It is done by an “intercessor” who manages the whole business, and it is likewise a practical step. In this rule, be it noted, nothing points to homicide as the specific cause of pollution, nor to any specific power that needs appeasing. At Cyrene again, another rule features two successive announcements, *προειπὼν* and *προερεῖ*.⁵ An evil spell has been conjured against a home. First the invidious enemy is called upon by name on three successive days, and then the ghosts whom he has raised are invited to hospitality. To be sure, the enemy is named just as the killer is named at Athens, and ghosts are invited just as the *elasteros* is invited at Selinus. Naming or inviting is often the purpose of a formal announcement: that is the extent of the similarity.

The Table Hospitality

There are two conceptions of the hospitable meal, both suggested by JJK, both advocated since. It may be that the person being purified offers it to the *elasteros*.⁶ Or it may be that a second person offers it to the person being purified.⁷ The alternatives are possible because the ends of successive lines are lost, where the one *ἡν*] *ποδεκόμενος* “receiving” and the one received, *τῷ αὐ*][*τῷ*, are specified. It has been argued that in the space available only the first alternative yields a consecutive sense (see chapter 1, p. 29). Here, for the sake of thoroughness, we should note that neither alternative is distinctive of homicide pollution.

Ghosts are offered hospitality, and so is Hecate, by fearful persons seeking to purify the house they live in (chapter 22, pp. 359–60). Yet such persons are not homicides. Far from this humble milieu, gods whom we adore are offered table hospitality in the rite of *theoxenia*. Purification is not involved. On the other hand, a person being purified receives hospitality of a sort, the help he needs, but not often

a meal. He is received, almost rescued, by some magnanimous host in literature and at Lindus and Cyrene by an official intercessor called ἀφικετεύων and at Athens by a corps of exegetes (chapter 22, pp. 365–67). Literature with its heightened colors tells mostly of homicides fleeing to a new land. But the documentary examples show that each city has its own standard form of purification and caters to local persons with a recognized difficulty. Homicides would not be among them, since they are dealt with by other means in the real world.

In any case, at Selinus the person being purified entertains an *elasteros* to a hospitable meal—not at home, but at some designated place. This person, according to his station, might remember how he formerly entertained Hecate at home, or with a larger group entertained Heracles at a sanctuary. As a good host he provides washing and supping and salt—and also sacrifices a piglet to Zeus, and goes away again. This sequence of actions is expressed by the two clauses [καὶ ἢ]ποδοκόμενος. . . δότο. . . [κ]αὶ θύσαι. . . ἔτο. It has been assumed that the hospitality and the sacrifice are distinct.⁸ But they need not be. Indeed they cannot be, for the hospitality is incomplete without a sacrifice.

The three items “washing and supping and salt” are provided straightway: water for washing, and bread and salt for the table. They have been carried to the spot. Any proper meal begins with a washing of hands, ἀπονίψασθαι, a ceremony evolved from a decency.⁹ As for ἀκρατίσθαι “supping,” the verb does not mean to “breakfast,” as it is commonly rendered, but to “eat a small bit as before breakfast”: to “sup,” as we may say, by dipping bread in wine.¹⁰ Is this the extent of the hospitable meal, together with a pinch of salt? Bread does not need salt, and bread and salt together are not a meal, certainly not a proper meal after the washing of hands.¹¹ They go with meat. The *Odyssey* has a formular scene for any gracious meal, with three elements. A maidservant pours water for washing, another brings bread to the table, and a manservant brings platters of meat (e.g. *Od.* 1.136–43).¹²

At Selinus, we cannot suppose that meat is dispensed with in a spirit of make-believe. The rite of table hospitality requires the utmost verisimilitude. At Cyrene, when ghosts are invited to a meal at home, they receive τό μέρος πάντων “the due portion of everything.”¹³ At home “everything” is easily provided from the household stores. But how is meat provided at this individually designated place? Bread and salt are carried from home, but not a platter of cold meat. Instead, the host sacrifices a piglet to Zeus, slaying and butchering with his own hand. And he sacrifices at the place where he lays the table, the place that he announced. It cannot be that he has slipped away to the public altar, which will first be mentioned on the occasion of sacrificing a

full-grown victim (line 10).¹⁴ At the last he departs “from there,” the place that is in view throughout.

This sacrifice of a piglet has been thought to mark the purification of a homicide.¹⁵ It need not in any case; many a piglet was slaughtered in many a purifying rite.¹⁶ Here the single word *θύσας* denotes a regular sacrifice—no purifying act, such as a sprinkling of blood on the person, can be assumed.

If then it is a regular sacrifice to Zeus, the meat will be used. We may be sure that it was used whenever a piglet is the designated victim of any normal sacrifice to any deity.¹⁷ Here, at the individually chosen place, a portion will serve for table hospitality. No doubt something will be burnt up for Zeus, and no doubt something more will be taken home. When the person takes his leave, the table offerings will remain. At Cyrene, the table offerings for a ghost or ghosts are at the last taken from the house and deposited with care in another place.

The Leave-Taking

After the hospitality and the sacrifice come five staccato imperatives, each joined by *καί*. This style and its particularity give weight to the leave-taking and to the lasting effect. The person shall “go forth” and “turn his back,” and thereafter he shall freely “converse” and “take food” and “sleep.”

παριστραφῆσθo, of a person’s turning motion, might signify either “turn round to the side,” whether right or left, or “turn right round,” i.e. turn one’s back, or “turn round full circle.”¹⁸ The word is used of turning to the right in the Roman style of prayer, and of turning round full circle while throwing a discus.¹⁹ As the Greeks have no regular habit of turning to one side or the other, the first meaning is unsuitable. Why would one turn round full circle, the third meaning, in a ritual context? So as to make an end, perhaps.²⁰ But then it should not follow “go forth from there.” On the other hand, to turn one’s back—to continue on one’s way without looking back—seems very apt. Not to look back is a notorious requirement of folktale that corresponds to a natural fear. The words

ἄστροφος, ἄστρεπτος, ἀνεπιστρεπτί,

μηδὲ... μεταστρεφθῆναι are used elsewhere of officiants departing from rites of purification or aversion, public or private.²¹ The departure here is from a place that the person has chosen for himself; it may well be a place remote and solitary.²²

The three present imperatives that follow are of a kind, denoting habitual actions. Obviously so, with “take food” and “sleep.” The verb

ποταγορεύω, Doric form of προσηγορεύω, is newly attested, though it was implied by the adjective ποτςγςρος used in poetry and by the Pythagoreans Philolaus and Polus.²³ The expected meanings are “address,” “greet,” “call by name.” To say that someone shall regularly be “addressed” or “greeted” or “called by name” is to say that he shall regularly converse with others.²⁴ It could as well be said that he shall himself “address” other people, or anyone he chooses or he meets with, or else that he shall “associate with” other people. But these expressions are too cumbersome. The word we have is the simplest way of putting it. The three verbs together are the simplest way of saying that a person shall resume normal life: conversing in the agora it might be, taking food on the job or in company or at home, sleeping at home or possibly away from home. The words “wherever he wishes” are added only once, at the last. But they cannot be taken with “sleep” alone because the option least applies to what we mostly do at home. The fuller style of the announcement repeats the option five times. Here a contrasting style achieves the same effect.

The usual interpretation of these few words, the usual understanding of the sequel, is rather different. The person resumes normal life, but in virtue of being accepted by others.²⁵ He was after all a homicide, a polluted creature dangerous to all around him, whose presence might bring down the roof or sink the ship. Until he was purified, he lived in isolation, shunned by the community. He was approached by no one—but now he “shall be addressed,” wherever he wishes. He was not invited to share a mixing bowl of wine—but now he “shall take food,” wherever he wishes. He was not admitted to any public building, nor allowed to board a ship—but now he “shall sleep,” wherever he wishes.

Such abhorrence of a homicide is otherwise known from poets and orators, both of whom invent and exaggerate. A straightforward documentary instance would be welcome. Do we have it here? If so, the homicide receives instructions not only for the rite of purification but for the happy result—he is told to mingle freely. This is not appropriate, however. It is other persons, society at large, who should be told to accept the homicide. And of the three verbs only “be addressed” can possibly signify that he rejoins society at large. To “take food” is not to share a companionable meal, and to “sleep” is typically done at home. It is altogether fanciful to speak of a homicide returning to the community.

Instead, the person is hereby assured, without reference to the attitude of others, that the ritual has been effective. The *elasteros* is appeased and will not threaten him at any moment of the day or night when he might think himself most vulnerable. Let us anticipate for a moment the conclusion of the next chapter, that *elasteros* means

“striker” and denotes the lightning. Lightning strikes the guilty when they are at large in the middle of the day, and it strikes them at home, and it strikes them especially as they lie abed.²⁶

Different Kinds of *Elasteros*

With such emphatic words the purifying ritual is brought to a close. It began in a general way, “if a person wishes to be purified of an *elasteros* by slaying with his own hand” (lines I-2), and went straight into details, minute details. Now attention turns to the being called *elasteros*. It is firmly stated that the ritual applies to any such being. Four kinds of *elasteros* are distinguished, and all other kinds are covered by the indefinite relative “whomsoever.”

The third and fourth kinds are the plainest, “or heard or seen.” It was implied at the outset that an *elasteros* might be somewhere heard or seen. While announcing the place and the time for the ritual, a person shall also announce “in whatever direction he wishes,” most likely (as was said) the direction in which the ritual will take effect and therefore the direction in which the *elasteros* is manifest. Admittedly, an angry ghost or avenging spirit will press himself upon the senses, but in a dream or a waking vision, in ways that might be better put than simple “heard or seen.” The difficulty has been felt, for notions vary widely as to how the terms apply.²⁷ But let us not prevaricate. The terms are uniquely appropriate to thunder and lightning, frightening powers that frighten us by these two means (chapter 15).

The first and second terms, *ενικδν* ^ε *πατρδιον*, being followed by “or heard or seen,” are somehow coordinate as well. With the approximate meaning “foreign or ancestral” they are taken to refer to different kinds of homicide. There is no agreement, however, as to which kinds are meant. Perhaps it is more exactly “stranger or kindred,” the killing of a stranger or of a kinsman.²⁸ A fundamental distinction indeed. But why does the lesser kind come first? Perhaps then the first kind is, quite shockingly, “of a host/guest.”²⁹ But why does this enormity command attention at Selinus? Other ventures are plainly unsatisfactory. Perhaps the two kinds are “sent from without,” by magic, or “within the family.”³⁰ Perhaps they are not quite homicide, but rather two kinds of serious offense causing pollution either through contact or through heredity (no translation is offered).³¹ These rival views combine to discredit the whole approach.

The two terms appear to evoke ritual. It is commonplace for a power to be called after a distinctive rite; it is a regular source of cult epithets. For example, Zeus as a “purifying” deity is called *katharsios* after a purifying rite. Now the rite that has just been prescribed is

table hospitality, known as *ενία* or *ενια*, *ενικός* refers to this—in the context, it would be astonishing if it referred to anything else. More exactly (the innumerable class of adjectives in *-ικς* express connection in many ways) it refers to hospitality received. The first kind of *elasteros* is therefore “entertained.” At Callatis, another colony of Megara at one remove, rites of Dionysus are described as *ενικά* in the sense of “offering hospitality, “welcoming.”³² To be sure, the different kinds of *elasteros* are here listed just because they are covered without exception by the rite of hospitality. It is illogical to begin by saying that the prototype is included. It is just as illogical to end by saying that everyone shall be purified “in the same way / as the *autorektas*”—the phrase has been thus expanded, as was shown in chapter 1, p. 30. We must not be pedantic; these illogical expressions are unmistakable in their meaning.

The term coordinate to *ενικός* is *πατρώιος* “ancestral,” i.e. customary. It makes a contrast insofar as the rite of hospitality is newly prescribed. The careful instructions of the tablet are original and unwonted, and yet they must have resembled rites used otherwise for a power called *elasteros* (cf. [chapter 15](#)). All such rites are “ancestral,” and a corresponding *elasteros* is likewise.

To define every possible kind of *elasteros* proved difficult for the rule-makers at Selinus. Two kinds are “entertained” versus “ancestral,” so called in respect of their rites. Two more are “heard” versus “seen,” so called because so apprehended. And then the essay in definition is concluded by an impatient “whomsoever.” No doubt the difficulty arose because the *elasteros* as a class is here first identified as a general threat.

The directive for being purified of an *elasteros* originally ended at this point, in line 8, stopping a little short of the end of the line. It ended by saying “he shall be purified in the same way”—i.e. by announcing the place and time, by laying a table and sacrificing to Zeus to provide the meat, and by taking leave with a gesture and a word. After this, in line 9, the tablet makes a fresh start, as is evident from the larger lettering and the resumptive language that fills this line—“as the *elasteros*. After one has been purified of an *elasteros*.”

The Public Altar

To sacrifice a full-grown victim at the public altar has the same result as before: “He shall be pure.”³³ A formal leave-taking is enacted, just as before: “He shall mark a boundary with salt, and sprinkle round with a gold vessel, and go away.” But the sacrifice is grander in all respects. The site is a public altar, whereas the individually designated spot would have no altar at all. The victim is full grown, not a piglet.

A gold vessel is employed, perhaps one that was kept handy at the public altar.³⁴

The duplication of the original rite is emphasized by the leave-taking. It is another magic operation, two coordinate participles followed by *ἀπίτο*. In lines 5–6 *ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἵτο* was followed by two coordinate verbs. In the present case, the use of salt and the sprinkling of water have more often been understood as a single operation, a sprinkling of salt water.³⁵ This goes against the natural meaning of the words and against the congruent language of the two leave-takings. Rather, we must suppose that first salt is strewn—so as to mark a boundary—and then water is sprinkled either at certain points or, less probably, along the same circuit as the salt.³⁶ Sprinkling water is a ritual action of the commonest—over persons, over things, over the floor or the ground.³⁷ The use of salt is common, if not in public worship, in the magic we often isolate as such, the magic of private persons for private purposes.³⁸ Strewing salt and sprinkling water were the magic actions that happened to come to mind. The magic actions before, turning right round and speaking out, were not any more distinctive.

The public altar is not identified; it is plain to see. Since the previous sacrifice was to Zeus and this one runs parallel, the altar is likely to be his.³⁹ We think at once of the agora, which always, in any city, has an altar of Zeus and to which people resort to consult documents such as the tablet. Furthermore, this altar was always a refuge for suppliants, as for the tyrant Euryleon at Selinus (Hdt. 5.46.2). When suppliants fled there in the last extremity, no doubt they sometimes sought to be purified.⁴⁰ The acropolis too is a possible setting but less likely.

The sacrifice at the public altar is much more showy than the rite of hospitality at some place individually chosen. But it is only a little more costly in requiring a full-grown victim—the gold vessel is not likely to be private property. And it only reinforces the purification that is already complete. Surely it is an afterthought. After lines I -8 were inscribed with the elaborate but trivial instructions for the rite of hospitality, the authorities reflected and decided to go further.

Any Sacrifice Thus Intended

At the last, a special mode of sacrifice is prescribed “whenever one needs to sacrifice *τῷ λαοτέροι*.” What necessary sacrifice is this, a sacrifice to the dread power called *elasteros*? Most comment has been very tentative, mistrusting the sequence of thought, leaving it open whether this is the sacrifice at the public altar or a different one suddenly envisaged.⁴¹ W. Burkert takes the latter view, with special

emphasis.⁴² A person obsessed with homicide pollution, he says, is always likely to relapse into sudden fears, whether purified or not. “Whenever,” etc., denotes a recurring periodic rite for an *elasteros*, a private cult or festival in his name. But a cult foundation for a ghost or avenging spirit is unparalleled. Column B gives painstaking instructions for lesser rites: how could it propose such a novel and important idea in just a line and a half?

The indefinite temporal clause can only be resumptive, so as to recall the sacrifices already mentioned, both the sacrifice of the piglet to Zeus and the sacrifice on the public altar, which is to Zeus as well. The dative τῷ ἐλάεττροι need not indicate an indirect object. Surely it means “for” the dread power, who is placated by means of a sacrifice to Zeus.

The sacrificial mode is strikingly described in opposing terms. First, *θύεν ὡςπερ τοῖς ἀθανάτοισι* “sacrifice just as to the immortals.” “The immortals,” an epic word and a metrical form, are the community of gods on the summit of Olympus. Second, *ζφαζέτο δ ζ γᾶν* “but one shall slay the animal with the blood running down to earth.” The sacrifice is mostly sent up to the sky, but the bloodletting points down to earth.

Something similar was said in column A, but the comparison is unhelpful.⁴³ The sacrifice to *Tritopatreis* foul is to be “just as to the heroes,” to *Tritopatreis* pure “just as to the gods.” It depends on the disposition of the offerings, on whether they go into the underground chamber at once, to be burnt up there, or are displayed on a table beforehand. It is like the contrast we hear of between different rites addressed at different times to the same Heracles, “as to a god” and “as to a hero.” Since Heracles was to the fore at Selinus and since his contrasting rites were of general interest in the fifth century, the notion doubtless contributed to the drafting of column A. But in column B the contrasting terms “just as to the immortals” and “with the blood running down to earth” are far from thoughts of either Heracles or *Tritopatreis*.

We must be clear about the poetic ring of the label “as to the immortals.” The very form *ἀθανάτοισι* accounts for most occurrences of the word in hexameter poetry.⁴⁴ Though it is used in many ways, one chiefly remembers it in formulas, among which about the commonest depicts a sacrifice, *ερδεν (ρέης) ιερὰς κατόμβας / ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι*.⁴⁵ Sacrifices “to the immortal gods” include some outstanding occasions. Odysseus recalls the one at Aulis when the snake devoured the swallows (Il. 2.305–6). Iris, in summoning the winds to kindle Patroclus’ pyre, declines to sit and feast with them, preferring sacrifice among the Ethiopians (Il. 23.206–7). At a terrible moment Eurylochus proposes to sacrifice the cattle of the Sun (Od.

To sacrifice “just as to the immortals” accordingly evokes the divine apparatus of epic tradition, those shining figures in the sky. But the bloodletting is done *ἐς γᾶν* “down to earth.” In [chapter 15](#) it is argued that an *elasteros* is a nameless power of lightning, akin to Zeus the lightning god—who is at once Zeus on high, king of Olympus, known by epithets that mean “flashing” and “booming” and the like, and Zeus as he strikes the ground, called *kataibates* “coming down” or indeed *elasteros* “striking.” Since the *elasteros* combines these two notions of the lightning, so does the form of sacrifice.

Slaying with One’s Own Hand

We turn at last to the term *αυτορέκτας* “slaying with one’s own hand.” In line 9 the substantive *ηοντορέκτας* “the one slaying with his own hand” sums up the rite prescribed in lines I–8 before two further rites are prescribed. In line I the rite is introduced by [*αντέρεκ*]τα[ς noun or adjective, “one slaying with his own hand” or “slaying with one’s own hand.” The word is restored but fits the space and the traces and is implied by the subsequent mention. If not this word, we would need to restore a synonym of the same length and similar spelling, an impossibility. It is here the predicate of a complementary infinitive, “to be purified of an *elasteros* as one slaying with his own hand” / “by slaying with one’s own hand.”

At Cyrene the very last rule has the heading *ἀκείιος τρίτος, αυτοφόνος*. This is generally taken to mean “suppliant the third, homicide,” as if the first word were a noun; “homicide” might be either adjective or noun. As we shall see, these three words all describe a purifying ritual, *καθαρμός* (chapter 22, pp. 356–57). *αυτοφόνος* distinguishes the third ritual from the two that precede. Again, it is a noun or an adjective with the meaning “one slaying with his own hand” or “slaying with one’s own hand.”

Both *αυτοφόνος* and similar *αυτο-* compounds, including *αυτορόγμων*, are used in Greek poetry. The sense “slaying with one’s own hand” is nearly always evident, whether referring to homicide, suicide, or the killing of a near relation, such as we often hear of in tragedy.⁴⁶ For a homicide the literal term is *ανδροφόνος* “manslayer,” used from Homer onward. Yet *αυτοφόνος* as a synonym is just as early. Long before it is otherwise attested, Homer gives the name *Αυτοφόνος* to a shameless assassin, a son of “Polyphontes,” who lies in wait for Tydeus (Il. 4.395). It is just possible that *αυτορέκτας*, *αυτορέγγων* were coined to denote slaying other than homicide.⁴⁷ *ρῥέζω* means simply “do” or “sacrifice”; it is *αυτο-* that makes it an intensive “doing”—“self-wreaking” we might say (the English verb may be

cognate).

Homicide then is a specific kind of slaying with one's own hand. It should not have been assumed for the *autophonos* at Cyrene and the *autorektas* at Selinus.⁴⁸ At Cyrene, as we shall see, the rite in question is a customary form of purification that certainly was not restricted to homicide and probably was never so used. At Selinus, as we have seen just now, the meaning is not suggested by anything in the context. And it produces no acceptable result. Consider where the meaning leads. In the first part, one will be "purified of an *elasteros* as homicide" (line 1), and again one will be "purified of any *elasteros* whomsoever in the same way as the homicide" (lines 7–9). Thereafter, one may sacrifice at any time to an *elasteros* (line 12). What is an *elasteros* if he is mostly separable from homicide? What are the many ritual occasions that are appended to the matter of homicide?

Think of *autorektas* as simply "slaying with one's own hand." The person purifies himself of an *elasteros* by a rite of table hospitality, for which the meat is provided by a sacrificial piglet. In sacrificing the animal, *θύσας*, this person acts alone. It is a modest occasion at some place individually chosen; he seems to be unaccompanied in his leave-taking. Afterward the same economic ritual is extended, in case there is doubt, to every imaginable kind of *elasteros*. The point about entertaining an *elasteros* to a meal seems to be that one does everything oneself. The hospitality is punctilious, intimate, exclusive. One even slays and butchers with one's own hand.

An objection may suggest itself. To sacrifice, *θύειν*, is the principal form of worship in Greek religion, a potent or holy act, *heilige Handlung*—and yet it is hardly ever said who slays the animal.⁴⁹ Whether the word is *θύειν* or a more particular term, it is regularly used without any implication of physical involvement. A person is told to sacrifice; a person speaks of sacrificing; a person is reported to have sacrificed. In each case the meaning is simply that he provides the animal or, if it is a priest or priestess, that he or she is present with the animal. Slaying and butchering are a task for those qualified by mere strength and skill, a task for butchers. But they are hardly ever mentioned, except in comedy. As a rule, it did not matter who took up axe or knife.

There is however a class of exceptions that has not been noticed. Certain rites are designated as *-φονία*, acts of slaying: notably the *Βουφόνια* "Oxslaying" of Athens, the *Ταυροφόνια* "Bull-slaying" of Mylasa, the *ἑκατομφόνια* "Hundred-slaying" of Messene. These are public festivals, all addressed to Zeus as the leading civic deity, in which a group of persons demonstratively slay the animals and then dine upon the meat. Such persons can be seen to represent the community.

Athens' "Ox-slaying" is described rather fully in one of Porphyry's excerpts from Theophrastus' work *On Piety*.⁵⁰ In this ritual of mid *Skirophorion* = June, conducted on the Acropolis for Zeus *polieus*, an ox is elaborately chosen and then elaborately slain. Men with goads drive oxen round the altar until the victim is revealed; girls bring water for a whetstone; men whet axe and knife; one man wields the axe to stun the animal, a second the knife to draw the blood; others flay; others still carve portions for the table. The officiants all belong to priestly families named for each vocation, from "goaders" to "carvers." But they stand for the community at large: in a legendary *aition* the Delphic oracle bids the Athenians, when they collectively inquire, to institute this ritual and "dine upon the slain animal without holding back." Understandably, the long-drawn ritual suggested a feeling of guilt about killing an ox. It was also fancifully said that the ritual illustrates general problems of responsibility, as treated by Athens' famous legal system. Here too the ritual actions reflect on the community at large.

At Mylasa little is known of the ritual of "Bull-slaying."⁵¹ But whereas the strangely named Zeus *osogôa* was in origin the proprietary god of the strangely named tribe *Otôrkondeis*, he was adopted by the city of Mylasa and honored at this festival by a general assembly of the citizens, with feasting on a large scale. An officiant is called *tauraphetês* "bull releaser," as if for a procedure by which, as at Athens, a certain animal declares itself the victim. At Messene again the "Hundred-slaying" honors Zeus of Mount Ithome.⁵² Young men of the graduating age-class seize and manhandle rams so as to slay and butcher and boil them in a display of prowess.

In no instance can we regard the festival business as age-old custom. The "Hundred-slaying" of Messene was instituted in or after 369 B.C., and the "Bull-slaying" of Mylasa at the time when the outlying cult of Zeus *osogoa* became a civic institution. At Athens it happened much earlier, perhaps in the eighth century. The "Ox-slaying" of 14 *Skirophoriûn* belongs to the same program of innovation as the festival *Skirophoria* two days earlier, an Acropolis procession that gave its unwonted name to the month as well.⁵³

At Selinus the authorities have created a frugal version of the rite for private use. A person chooses some place apart and conducts the ritual entirely by himself. The largest part of it is to slay and butcher a piglet so as to produce the meat for table hospitality.

1. So JJK 40–45, 54–56, 65, 70, 73–76, 116–20. The main discussions since are Dubois (1995a, 559–62; 1995b, 138–44), Clinton (1996, 174–79), B. Jordan (1996, 327–28), North (1996, 295–98), Schwabl (1996), Arena (1997, 436–39), Giuliani (1998), Burkert (1999, 29–33; 2000), Johnston (1999, 47–49). See also Ekroth

(2002, 409, index s. *ἐλάστερος*).

2. JJK 41 indeed suggest that “it is intended not for a human but for a supernatural auditor”—which stultifies certain parallels they have just cited (as in notes 3–4).

3. IG i³ 104.20 as restored, [Dem.] 43 *Macart.* 57.

4. SEG 50.1638 lines 133, 137 = LS *Suppl.* 115 B 51, 55.

5. SEG 50.1638 lines 113, 116 = LS *Suppl.* 115 B 31, 33.

6. JJK 16–17, 41–42, 54–56, Dobias-Lalou (1997, 267–68), Johnston (1999, 47–48), Ekroth (2002, 279Π317).

7. JJK 56n2, 75–76 (debating both possibilities), Clinton (1996, 175–77), Giuliani (1998, 68–69, 80), Burkert (2000, 211).

8. JJK 41–43, Jameson (1994, 44–45), Dubois (1995a, 560; 1995b, 141), Clinton (1996, 176; 2005, 17475), Giuliani (1998, 75, 80), Burkert (2000, 210–11).

9. See Ginouves (1962, 151–56).

10. *ἀκρατίσασθαι τὸ μικρὸν ἐμφαγεῖν πρὸ ἀρίστου*. Phryn. *Praep. soph.* p. 39, Phot. s.v. Bread is mentioned by Aristomenes Com. fr. 14

K-A and others in Athenaeus’ account of *ἀκρατισμός* (*epit.* 1.19, iic-e). In rendering it as “breakfast,” JJK 42 err with *LSJ* and *LSJ Rev. Suppl.*

11. According to Burkert (1999, 30–31; 2000, 211), the meal is a symbolic “minimum.” He thinks of three kinds of vessel (basin, beaker, and bowl) and of three staple commodities (water [“a rare commodity in Greece”], wine, and salt). For this too much extrapolation is needed.

12. Whereas the scene is formular in itself, the several passages have been further assimilated to each other by expansion, and a given element is sometimes redoubled, as it were. Such scenes are discussed by S. West on *Od.* 1.139–40, 4.52–58, J. B. Hainsworth on *Od.* 7.172–83, A. Heubeck on *Od.* 10.368–72, A. Hoekstra on *Od.* 15.135–39 (Oxford commentary, 1988–1992).

13. Also *τὰ μέρη* “the (aforesaid) portions”: SEG 50.1638 lines 119, 121 = *LS Suppl.* 115 B 37, 39.

14. According to JJK 42, 65, and Scullion (1998, 119), *ἐξ αὐτοῦ* from it” refers to this public altar. (Scullion further posits a fossil meaning “from the sanctuary,” corresponding to *ἐπ’ αὐτὸ* “at the sanctuary” as a phrase he discerns in a difficult passage of Thoricus’ calendar of sacrifice.) No, the public altar is a contrasting site. And when a person is told emphatically to choose any place at all to be purified, he will not know that he must go somewhere else to sacrifice a piglet.

15. So Clinton (1996, 176), Johnston (1999, 47), Burkert (2000, 210–11). But JJK 43, 65, take it as “a normal sacrifice to Zeus,” and Clinton (2005, 175) now regards it as normal and as demonstrating the effect of purification, like the sacrifice on the public altar.

16. Parker (1983, 21, 30, 283nii, 372–73) (homicide purification only shares the general custom).

17. So Clinton (2005, 174).

18. *LSJ* record only the third meaning (s.v. i, which includes throwing the discus); the other uses they distinguish are transitive (s.v. 2–3). JJK 43 propose either “turn right round” or “turn round full circle.” Burkert (2000, 207–8, 210) translates “he shall look around” while explaining that the killer was previously isolated. Note in any case that *περς-* verbs are favored for purifying or magical actions. F. Pfister, *RE Suppl.* 6 (1935) 149–51 s. Katharsis collects a dozen instances

besides *περικαθαίρω* itself. The authorities at Selinus use words evocatively.

19. Plutarch in his *Roman Lives* and *Questions* employs *περιστρέφω* often

for the custom of turning to the right to utter a prayer. Plainest is *Cam.* 5.9:

καθάπερ ἐστὶ Πωμαίοις ἔθος... ἐπὶ δεξιὰ ἐξελίττειν, ἐσφάλη περιστρεφόμενος.

20. JJK 43 suppose that in Roman ritual if not in Greek the word means “turn round full circle.” But the two passages they cite from Plutarch refer like others to turning rightward for prayer.

21. Aesch. *Choeph.* 99 (offerings at Agamemnon’s grave), Soph. *Oed. Col.* 490 (Eumenides alias Erinyes), Apoll. *Argon.* 3.1038–39 (Hecate), Theocr. *Id.* 24.96 (Hecate), Plut. *De def. or.* 15, 418b (strange offerings at the Delphic *Septeria*), *PGM* 4.46, 7.439–40 (magic operations). JJK 43 mention most of these instances and

others more general. They are mistaken, however, in citing *ἀναποδίζω* in *PGM*, for the word plainly means “step back,” “walk backward,” in effect the opposite procedure (the literary meanings cited by *LSJ* s.v. are all of them a figurative stepping back or making another do so). At *PMG* 4.45–46 the operator first walks backward in his old clothes and then in new ones withdraws without looking back.

22. At Cyrene there is a leave-taking of an opposite kind. Ghosts are invited into the home they threaten; at the last the portions of food and the ghosts themselves, i.e. the figurines that represent them, are carried far away to a desolate place.

23. Cf. Dubois (1995a, 561; 1995b, 141). JJK 43 wrongly treat it as a Doric form of *-αγορεύω*.

24. To “be addressed” is not an immediate consequence of being purified, as JJK suppose. At Cyrene a person who has just been purified is greeted by religious silence (*SEG* 50.1638 line 136 = *LSCG Suppl.* 115 B 54).

25. The notion of a homicide rejoining the community is common to JJK 43, 54, Dubois (1995a, 561; 1995b, 141), Clinton (1996, 176), North (1996, 297) (citing also D. Harvey), and Burkert (2000, 210, 213–14). Giuliani (1998, 86–88) thinks of a lesser offender likewise restored to the community by a process he calls “reintegration” rather than “reentry.”

26. At large: the Tarentines at Carbina, Iasion in the furrow. At home: Oenomaus, Periphas. In bed: Ixion, Periphas. These instances are noted in [chapter 15](#).

27. “Heard” and “seen” have in fact been variously understood. JJK 44 see a possible contrast to “explicit declarations” by the victim’s kin or a compendious reference to “all manifestations” or a parallel to the Assyrian ghosts who need to be identified. Clinton (1996, 178) takes “heard,” “seen,” “whoever at all” together as describing any “effect ... on the body or mind of the person pursued” (i.e. both an apparition and a guilty conscience?). Dubois (1995b, 142) and Giuliani (1998, 79–82) think of an offense heard or seen and therefore avenged by an *elasteros*. For all four adjectives B. Jordan (1996, 328) suggests with hesitation a “foreign” or “native” man “overheard” or “observed” while committing a crime.

28. JJK 44, 119–20, Dubois (1995a, 561; 1995b, 142–43), Johnston (1999, 47–49), Burkert (2000). Apoll. *Argon.* 4.716–17 is cited as a parallel. When Circe purifies Jason and Medea, she does so in ignorance of their crime, whether they are “stained with a stranger’s blood or even with a kinsman’s.” But it is not a parallel. The crimes are cited in ascending order just because Circe is prepared to overlook any aggravation.

29. Clinton (1996, 178–79), Johnston (1999, 49) (as an equal possibility).

30. Burkert (2000, 209).

31. Giuliani (1998, 71–74, 78–88).

32. The trieteric festival called *Διονύσια τὰ ξενικά*, on which see Avram (2002), honors the mature Dionysus, representing the potency of the new

wine, as he arrives from overseas. Hospitality for Dionysus typically includes the favors of a local beauty such as the *basilinna* at Athens.

33. Without the correct articulation of the *ἐπεὶ* clause, doubts arise as to the purport of all that follows. The difficulties are made explicit by Clinton (1996, 177–79), North (1996, 295–98), Giuliani (1998, 75, 80–81).

34. *χρυσός* “gold vessel” was no doubt a common usage; *ἐν χρυσῷ πίνειν* is a proverbial expression (Luc. *Merc. cond.* 26, cited by LSJ). It appears in a similar context in the Pythagorean precept *ἢ χρυσῷ ἢ θαλάττῃ περιρραίνεσθαι* (Iambl. *Vit. Pyth.* 153), and this is further evidence of its general currency. The equivalent form *χρυσῶν* has the same meaning in many passages of the rules for Demeter’s cult on Cos, calling for persons or places to be sprinkled from a gold vessel, *περιρανάτω, περιρανάσθω, ἀπὸ χρυσίου* (LSCG 154 A-B, 300–250 B.C.). It is done with priestesses (A 29–30, 43–45, *quater*), shrines (B 2, 4, 6, *ter*), *aphidrumata* (B 15), even the *damos* (B 26–27). Maybe the ritual vessel had a special shape for sprinkling. Ion as temple servitor uses golden jugs, *χρυσέαις πρόχοισιν* (Eur. *Ion* 434–35), but this is only to fill up water basins from which others will draw. Manganaro (1997, 563) is notably inexact in speaking of “a golden *κύλιξ*.”

35. JJK 45, duly quoted by Arena (1997, 438), leave it open between one operation or two. According to Dubois (1995a, 561; 1995b, 142), an area is marked off, then sprinkled with sea water (he calls the expression “chiasmus”). Burkert (1999, 32; 2000, 212) insists on salt and gold as an ancient mystical pairing. But the Pythagorean precept (note 34) most likely means “use either the lustral vessel or good old seawater,” despite Iamblichus, it need be no more than a helpful hint for bloodstains in a shrine. Burkert further adduces a fragment of Menander’s

Theoporumene (if rightly attributed) where we read *καὶ τὸ χρυσίου* and *θάλατταν ἐκχέον* in successive lines. W. G. Arnott, however, thinks of gold-bearing Pactolus, for the context is all about Cybele and Lydia (Menander, Loeb ed., vol. 3, 64–65, Cambridge, Mass., 1996).

36. In note 34 the instances of *χρυσῶν vel ἀπὸ χρυσίου περιρραίνεσθαι* never refer to tracing a circuit unless it is conceivable that the *damos* was so treated.

37. Cf. Ginouves (1962, 299–318) on *perirrhanthêrion* and *chernips*, Cole (1988), I. Krauskopf, *ThesCRA* 5 (2005), 165–83, “ritual cleansing.”

38. Cf. Gow on Theocr. 24.97, Bühler on Zen. Ath. 2.68, O. Paoletti, *ThesCRA* 2 (2004) 20, “purification:salt.”

39. So JJK 45, 65 (but they suppose that the same sacrifice was meant in line 5). It is the altar of an *elasteros*, says Dubois (1995a, 561), maybe of Zeus *elasteros* as on Paros. Clinton (1996, 178) thinks of “an unspecified god.”

40. See Robertson (1992, 51–58) on Athens’ altar of Zeus *agoraios*, famous for the legendary suppliants whom Athens saved from persecution. Martin (1951, 182–83) speaks of both purifying and oath-taking as rites appropriate to Zeus *agoraios*, with a pig as the usual victim. But his instances do not at all bear this out. Unrelated temples are purified with a pig on Delos and at Eleusis, places of assembly at Athens. The last may possibly include the agora, though it is not mentioned (see Jacoby’s parallels to Ister *FGrH* 334 F 16 and also Clinton [2005, 169]), but in no case is the pig sacrificed on an altar of Zeus *agoraios*.

41. See JJK 65, 116, Lupu (2005, 387), and notes 33 and 39, this chapter.

42. Burkert (1992, 193n40; 1999, 32–33; 2000, 211–12). He speaks *inter alia*

of Clytaemnestra's pact with the *daimon* of the Pleisthenidae and of a provision in Draco's law for compounding with the victim's relatives. Yet these things do not indicate any continuing ritual.

43. The phrases "just as to the gods" in column A and "just as to the immortals" in column B have hitherto been treated as synonymous: so Ekroth (2002, 275), Henrichs (2005, 56), Clinton (2005, 176).

44. *LfrgEs*. *ἀθάνατος* (Dieter Matthes): *ἀθανάτοισι(ν)* 169 (177), -οῖς 5 (8), -οῖς 9. The figures in brackets add *variae lectiones* to the "vulgate."

45. *LfrgEs*. *ἀθάνατος* I A (adjective), 1 B (noun), 1 e β bb aa (vol. 1 col. 198 lines 44–53, col. 201 line 67– col. 202 line 10). The formula gives rise to looser expressions that recall it.

46. Parker (1983, 122, 350–51) provides a succinct account of such words. It is a natural development to use them also of a "killer" who has not done the deed himself.

47. The phrase *αὐτορέγμονος πότμου* is cited from Aeschylus' *Cressae* and is said to refer to a man's suicide (Hsch. s.v. = Aesch. fr. 117 Radt /165

Mette); the gloss *αὐτόρεξον*, unattributed, is explained as *αὐτόρεκτον* with the same meaning (*Anec. Bekker* 1.467, Phot. α 3247 Theodoridis, cf. Radt on Aesch. fr. 117). Oppian, *Cyn.* 2.567, *Hal.* 1.763, describes certain mollusks as

αὐτόρρεκτος "self-made," i.e. generated spontaneously. This seems a different matter entirely but is cited by Dubois (1995b, 139) in support of the

meaning "responsible agent," which he attributes to *αὐτορέκτας* (note 48).

Note, too, that the words] *ον Φρέξαντα* appear in a sacred law of Cleonae among rules of purification with accusative and infinitive (*LSCG* 56, early sixth century); suggested restorations vary widely.

48. So JJK 40, 44–45, 54–56; they have been generally followed (Graham [1995, 367] holds that the second part concerns a homicide but the first part someone else). The meaning "homicide" is, however, doubted by Dubois (1995a, 560; 1995b, 139–40), Dobias-Lalou (1997, 266), and Giuliani (1998, 78), who all prefer something like "culpable," "responsible," "directly responsible." It is reaffirmed by Burkert (1999, 2000) and Maffi (2001).

49. Epic narrative we discount and also Xenophon's record of his single-handed achievements.

50. Porph. *De abstin.* 2.29–31 = Theophr. *De piet.* fr. 18 Potscher. Parker (2005c, 187–91) discusses the *Buphonia*, alias *Dipolieia*, in the light of other recent discussion. This is the most notorious and controverted of all Athenian festivals. The facts are bound up with competing aetiologies, which invent while purporting to explain; the parallels we adduce will depend on our understanding of the facts—except that the label -φρνια is undoubted.

51. See Laumonier (1958, 101–26) on Zeus *osogoa*, (114) on the title *ταυραφότης* (he thinks the term *ἀφίημι* refers to "starting" a contest, not to "submerging" the victim at sea). A newly found inscription may contain a relevant detail; like many other documents it is concerned with the leasing of Zeus *osogoa*'s

extensive domain. In a fragmentary context we hear of

τοῦ] Διὸς τοῦ Ὀσογῶ *τραπ[εζ-* (*SEG* 51.1525 line 17). "The table of Zeus *osogoa*" appears to be a site at which a settlement will be agreed to by disputing parties; it must be named for the festival ceremony.

52. See Robertson (1992, 219–31), with mention of still other rites possibly similar.

53. See Robertson (2004, 121–22, 132–36, 148; 2005b, 65–68). Details of the

innovation emerge from sacrificial calendars—from the all-embracing civic calendar of Nicomachus and from the unchanging rural ones of Erchia and Thoricus. They have come to light more recently, but the festival *Skirophoria* has long been suspect as a political contrivance aimed at Eleusis. Parker (2005c, 173–77) dismisses this and also refuses to distinguish *Skira* and *Skirophoria* as different entities, the source of much confusion in the scholia. The proper distinction is now forced upon us by the rural calendars that speak of the *Skira* as a festival of Demeter, remote from the Acropolis and its cults of Athena and Poseidon.

Zeus *Elasteros* and Other Lightning Gods

Synopsis

A nameless power called *elasteros* is the object of all the ritual prescribed by column B. The word is thought to mean “avenger,” but the lexical evidence for such a meaning is illusory. The only attested use is as an epithet of Zeus, and the undoubted meaning is “striker,” from *elaunô* “strike.” In early poetry Zeus’ lightning is denoted by *elaunô* in both literal and figurative expressions; Orphic poetry always insisted on this old usage, apropos of the blasting of the Titans. Inscriptions naming Zeus *elasteros* have been found on Paros and Thasos in a special context, the worship of Zeus and other household gods by kinship groups called *patrai* “fatherhoods,” as at the festival *Apaturia* “Common-father [rites].” The worship of household gods by professed “fathers” goes back to the very origin of the *Apaturia* as a pan-Ionian custom. Both Zeus the household god and Zeus the wielder of the lightning go back very much further; they are among the most widespread customs of Greek cities.

As lightning god, whether in the city or in the household, Zeus is supplicated with a distinctive ritual that must be very old. The *patrai* are named for it (kinship groups in charge of any ritual are often named for it), and it gives rise to several aetiological stories. A booth is made to look like an imposing house, and a table within it is laden with a substantial meal, only to be set afire by worshippers who run away. The table hospitality of column B, with its elaborate invitation and demonstrative leave-taking, is a reduced version.

Zeus the lightning god has his place in the calendar, like any power of nature. He is worshipped at need from late summer to the beginning of winter, with a once-great festival at the last. For most of the time, while tree crops ripen, and throughout the long-drawn toil of plowing and sowing, lightning and heavy weather are not wanted; the lightning god must be appeased. But he is summoned in full strength at his November festival, so as to bring the necessary rains of winter.

Lightning then is a general concern throughout the half year when column B is displayed.

For Zeus “striker” column B substitutes any nameless “striker,” while proposing a form of ritual distinctive of Zeus, together with a sacrifice to Zeus that provides the meat. The substitution is made because the ritual has been kept to very modest proportions, conformably with the purpose of the tablet. Nameless powers exist beside the gods of cult in every department of nature, and a few nameless powers of lightning are mentioned elsewhere.

Elastoros “Avenger”?

The accepted interpretation of column B starts from the two words *αὐτορέκτας* and *ἔλσπερος*. As to the former, we have seen that its literal meaning “slaying with one’s own hand” refers not to homicide but to the manner of offering table hospitality. Yet this ritual and other ritual that is prescribed do not serve to identify the fearful power called *ἐλάσπερος* (lines 1, 9, 12). It has been taken as an angry ghost or avenging spirit, conformably with the notion of homicide.¹ One or other of these meanings is accepted, and no other meaning is envisaged, by all who have discussed the tablet. This prepossession is remarkable, since it relies on the poorest of evidence.

Good evidence is not lacking. The word *ἐλάσπερος* occurs as an epithet of Zeus in several inscriptions of Paros.² On Thasos, a colony of Paros, Zeus has the epithet *ἀλάστορς*, obviously the same.³ At Elea he has a fragmentary epithet plausibly restored as *ἀλ[αστήρ]*.⁴ It is not at once apparent, it never is, what the cult epithet means.⁵ For the moment we shall close our eyes to the inscriptions. We are directed rather to ancient grammarians, for whom *ἀλάστορς* is a strange gloss attributed to Aeschylus.

Oddly, it is quoted in two occurrences by different sources. *Epim. Hom.* α 284 Dyck (s.v. *ἀλαστήσας*) gives us *πρενμενής ἀλάστορς* “in *Ixion*” (fr. 92 Nauck⁶ / 317 Mette). Phot. α 900 Theodoridis gives us *μῆγαν ἀλάστορον* in a play unspecified (fr. 294 Nauck⁷ / 753 Mette / *92a Radt). The two occurrences are puzzling. The different adjectives (*πρενμενής*, *μέγαν*) seem to give opposite views, favorable and unfavorable, of an *alastoros*.⁸ Furthermore, the occurrence alleged for *Ixion* echoes *Eumenides* 236 *δέχον δὲ πρειμενῶς ἀλάστορα* “receive an offender graciously” (*loquitur* Orestes).⁹ There appears to be no similarity of meaning between the phrase of *Ixion* and the corresponding line in *Eumenides*—even though there is every similarity between Orestes and *Ixion*.¹⁰ Can we believe it accidental that two rare words, *preumenes* and *alastoros* / *alastôr*, are twice juxtaposed in the little that remains of Aeschylus’ work?

The actual fragment μέγαν ἀλάστορον has been conjecturally assigned to *Ixion* ever since G. Hermann. Nauck supposed that both occurrences were formerly quoted together in *Epim. Hom.*, with this one assigned to *Ixion*, and the other not: e.g. Αἴσχυλος Ἰξίονι <‘μέγαν ἀλάστορον’ καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ> ‘πρεμυνῶς ἀλοστορον’.¹¹ Radt therefore keeps only the *Ixion* fragment and renumbers accordingly. It has been objected that the phrase πρεμυνῶ ἀλοστορος is established beyond suspicion by “the grammatical context.”¹² *Epim. Hom.* gives the sequence of forms ἄλαστος > ἀλαστῶ > ἀλάστωρ > ἀλάστορος, probably drawing on Herodian, for Herodian’s doctrine of “metaplasm” will explain how the nominative ἀλάστορος arose from the genitive of ἀλοστορ. But on such a point of linguistics, as we understand the subject now, Herodian is no authority.¹³

It thus appears that *Eumenides* 236 has been distorted in order to supply another instance of the rare word *alastoros*. We can guess how it all started. The line will have attracted learned comment. Orestes presents himself as a suppliant, to be compared hereafter with *Ixion*, the archetypal suppliant for purification from blood guilt (441, 717–18). Comment would naturally refer to the play *Ixion*; it would naturally adduce a line describing archetypal *Ixion*. In that line too the form ἀλάστορον is probably distorted—it too, like ἀλάστορος, will represent ἀλάστορα. *Ixion* can be called ἀλοστορ just as well as Orestes, and μέγαν ἀλάστορα > ἀλάστορον is a small distortion beside the other in *Eumenides*, far more violent. Why did the bogus form arise? It was probably inspired by the epithet of Zeus, whether this was adduced in the learned comment or Aeschylus somehow played on it in *Ixion*. In either case, there is no reason to think that the epithet is truly related to ἀλάστωρ.

Besides Aeschylus, *Epim. Hom.* points to an occurrence in “Pherecydes” (*FGrH* 3 F 175—both Jacoby and Fowler doubt the ascription). “And Pherecydes says, ‘Zeus is called ἰκέσιος and ἀλάστορος.’” The eye of faith will see objective confirmation that the latter has to do with vengeance. But Aeschylus’ commentators could hardly refrain from adducing the cult epithet no matter what it meant.

In surviving literature the adjective ἀλάστορος occurs only once, in a lyrical and alliterative passage of Sophocles: (ἐλκος) ἀλαὸν ἀλαστόροισιν (κύκλοις) “a blinding wound for blighted eyes” (*Ant.* 974).¹⁴ Long after, we meet the noun ἀλαστορία “retribution” (*Jos. Ant. Jud.* 17.1.1). Both words are used expressively to evoke ἀλάστωρ; they are literary coinages to this effect.¹⁵ Should we suppose that the cult epithet of Zeus, ἀλάστορος / ἐλάστερος, is the same word in origin? We would then expect Zeus to be called

ἀλoστωρ as well, the basic form. Yet he is never so called, except in two moralizing texts of late antiquity, Cornutus and *H. Orph.* 73, and by lexicons that reflect the same usage.¹⁶

Elasteros “Striker”

The etymology and meaning of Zeus’ epithet are not hard to establish. As between the forms ἀλάστορος and ἐλάστερος, which is prior? If ἀλάστορος is prior, we cannot explain why the other form arose beside it. But if λoστερος is prior, this unusual word might well give way to a form that seems to express Zeus’ awesome moral purpose—provided, of course, that the cult was suitable. (It is, as the cult of the lightning god.) For ἐλάστερος, it is natural to think of the stem ἐλαστρέω, so like ἐλάστερος, is a strengthened or frequentative λαονω.

The epithet was in fact so derived before the Selinus tablet came to light.¹⁷ The derivation is now endorsed by JJK and others.¹⁸ But the meaning of ἐλαύνω with reference to Zeus has not been grasped. JJK explain that ἐλαύνω, ἐλαύνω sometimes mean “pursue”—a specialized “drive” (cf. *LSJ* s. ἐλαύνω I 4)—and is accordingly used of the Furies and other avenging spirits. They further explain that ἐλαύνω also means “drive out,” another specialized sense (*LSJ* s.v. I 3), and is accordingly used of purifying measures.¹⁹ This is not entirely logical. Both meanings are secondary, but a cult epithet will show a single basic meaning, inasmuch as it describes the function for which a god is urgently implored. So will that other word ἀλάστωρ (with its artificial duplicate ἀλάστορος), which JJK and others equate with ἐλάστερος. It is unrelated. Not all linguists, perhaps, are quite sure that ἀλάστωρ and kindred words are formed from ἀprivative and the stem λαθ-, but none supposes that they are formed from the stem ἐλα- of ἐλαύνω.²⁰

The meaning of λαthat suits a cult epithet of Zeus is “strike,” with reference to lightning. ἐλαύνω is so used of Zeus at *Od.* 5.131–32 = 7.249–50: νῆα θοὴν ἀργῇτι κεραυνῶι / Ζεὺς ἐλάσας ἐκέασσε “Zeus struck the swift ship with white lightning and smashed it.”²¹ The usage does not occur more often because there are several synonyms for “strike.” Indeed the same lightning strike happens to be described elsewhere in more discursive passages by both βαλὼν and πληγεῖσα (*Od.* 12.387–88 and 416). We should note as well that Poseidon, with the trident in his hand, “struck” (ἤλασε) and split the Gyraean rock so as to kill Ajax (*Od.* 4.506–7). Both pictorial and literary evidence are rightly taken to show that Poseidon’s trident was in origin the lightning, a characteristic weapon

likewise of this rival weather god.²² Aside from the lightning, “strike” is a very common meaning of *ἐλαύνω*.²³ It is impossible to say how it relates to the other common meaning “drive,” since the etymology of the word is unknown.²⁴

In later poetry the cult epithet is sometimes evoked in figurative words and phrases. *ἐλαύνω* is famously applied to Zeus and his lightning by Pindar. The god is invoked as *ἐλασίμβροντα* “driving-thunder” in an unknown poem (fr. 144) and in *Olympian* 4 as *ἐλατῆρ ὑπέρτατε βροντᾶς ἀκαμαντόποδος* “driver on high of tireless-footed thunder.” Horace imitates Pindar in saying of Jupiter that “he drove his thundering horses and winged chariot” (*Carm.* 1.34.7–8).²⁵ In all these passages thunder is compared to horses, and Zeus to their driver. The image of driving thunder-horses is not an obvious one; it originates with the epithet *ἐλάστερος*.

But the primary sense of *ἐλάστερος* is evident in certain allusions to Zeus’ “striking” the Titans. In general—in Hesiod and later poetry and in many pictorial scenes—Zeus overwhelms them with his lightning.²⁶ Callimachus and Nonnus both use the verb *ἐλαύνω* with reference to a particular version of the story.

Callimachus’ *Hymn to Zeus* begins by invoking him as *Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα, δικασπόλον Οὐρανίδησι* “striker of Titans, arbiter among Olympians” (*H. Jov.* 3). The two divine generations have contrasting names that refer to “earth” (*πηλός*) and to “sky” (*οὐρανός*). Some ancient commentators were misled by the former name, as others are even now. In a familiar story, Giants, not Titans, are born of Earth when she grows resentful of Zeus; accordingly, Callimachus’ word was glossed both as “Titans” and as “Giants.”²⁷ It is obvious, however, that Callimachus here means the Titans, elder gods who give way to the Olympians, a scheme common to both Homer and Hesiod. In Hesiod the Titans are indeed born of Earth, but at an earlier juncture, when she mates with Sky. Callimachus follows a different account in which Earth produces the Titans, like the Giants, without a male partner. We are meant to recognize this account straightway; it can only be an Orphic one.

Nonnus shows the context. Zeus, he says, dealt thus with the Titans after they wickedly murdered Zagreus, the first Dionysus:

*μητέρα Τιτῆνων ἐλάσας ποινήτορι πυρσῶι
Ζαγρέος εὐκεράοιο κατεκλήμισσε φονῆας
Ταρταρίω πυλεῶνι*

“Having struck the mother of the Titans with avenging flame, he shut up the slayers of horned Zagreus within the gate of Tartarus” (*Dion.* 6.208–10). Now Hesiod vividly describes how earth sizzled and

spattered in consequence of Zeus' lightning (*Theog.* 693–95), but it is not earth personified. In Nonnus Zeus targets the personified Earth as the culpable mother of the Titans; he follows the same version as Callimachus. There is another echo in Himerius, who concludes an account of the Orphic Dionysus as follows: “Having restored Dionysus, as the story goes. [Zeus] caused the Titans *παρὰ τῶν μύθων ἐλαίνεσθαι* to be bandied by the stories” (Or. 9.4 = *Orph.* fr. 318 vi Bernabe / 214 Kern).²⁸ This exquisite choice of words is also an ominous reference to their *being struck* by lightning.²⁹

Orphic doctrine as often preserves an old usage in a studied fashion. But literature in general reflects the cult of Zeus *λοσπερος* in a way so obvious we do not see it. From Homer onward poets lavish epithets on Zeus, mostly compound adjectives, that depict him as lord of the lightning, wielding it, rejoicing in it, arrayed in flashes and booms, and so on.³⁰ Yet for the lightning god of cult the only other epithet in common use is *καταιβάτης* “descender,” a different conception altogether.³¹ It is *ἐλάστερος* alone that evokes the potentate in the sky.

Cults of Zeus *Elasteros*

Cults of Zeus *ἐλάστερος* appear on Paros and of Zeus *ἀλάστορος* on Thasos and probably at Elea. The context of each, so far as known, suits the lightning god. At Elea a cippus is inscribed

[Ζ]ηνὸς ἀλ[αστόρο] / [κα]ὶ ὥριο (so Guarducci).³² It is objected that the first epithet might equally begin *ἀν*[or *ἀμ*], but neither leads

to a suitable result.³³ The second epithet is naturally taken as *οὔριος* “of fair winds,” a cult widely known and appropriate to this race of mariners, the Phocaeans of Elea; there is not a plausible alternative.³⁴ The two epithets refer to related powers or aspects of the weather god, lightning and wind. In Hesiod's *Theogony* Zeus overcomes the Titans with the help of Cyclopes and Hundred-handers, the respective forces of lightning and of wind, which he then incorporates in his new dispensation (admittedly the Hundred-handers are storm winds). It may be that these two epithets are conjoined in the inscription so as to be comprehensive, describing the weather god at opposite seasons. He sends lightning and with it usually rain in autumn and winter. In spring and summer he sends fair winds. The calendar of the Tetrapolis

of Marathon prescribes sacrifice to *Διὶ ὀρίῳ* in the month *Skirophorion*, on either the eleventh or twelfth.³⁵ The epithet is more likely *οὔριος* than *ὄριος* as commonly thought. For this is the very moment of the threshing and the winnowing in the festival calendar.³⁶

On Paros Zeus *ἐλάστερος* lends his name to five stones dating from the late sixth century through the fifth to perhaps the fourth: a stele naming an altar, an altar, two boundary markers, and a small column that supported a lustral water basin or possibly an offering.³⁷ On the boundary markers he has the further epithet *patroios*, and the altar belongs to a kinship group called “the descendants of *Mandrothemis*.” These last items must be interpreted in the light of fuller evidence on Thasos.

The altar tells us something of the ritual, being inscribed with the rule *μέλιτι / σπένδεται* “libation is of honev” (IG 12.5.1027).³⁸

Honey liquified with either milk or water is *μελίκρατον* “honey-mix,” which at Selinus is prescribed for pure *Tritopatreis*. As JJK remark, honey is offered in this form to fearsome powers for its soothing effect.³⁹ But fearsome powers are not exclusively avenging spirits. Despite all the assertions of modern books, the *Tritopatreis* are wind gods (chapter 11). Though honey is not otherwise attested for a lightning god, there is a comparable offering to Zeus

καβάτας, i.e. *καταιβάτης*, at Thalamae in Laconia: [ἀ]λέθειον “meal” (IG 5.1.1316).⁴⁰ This is Hesychius’ word

ἀλήσιον· πᾶν τὸ ἀλληλεσμένον. Barley meal is no less characteristic than honey, being sprinkled or burnt as a piacular offering to dread powers.⁴¹ And here it is offered to the lightning god.

At Gythium, in the cult of Zeus *καππώτας*, another lightning god, it must have been the custom to sit upon his thunder-stone in suppliant style, for when Orestes did so he was cured of his madness (Paus. 3.22.1).⁴²

On Thasos Zeus *ἀλάστορος* appears on two boundary markers dated respectively 450–430 b.c. and perhaps a generation later, among a series of such markers or of wall blocks used in the same way inside an extramural sanctuary northeast of the city at the site called Evraiokastro.⁴³ In naming one god or another they identify a given area of the sanctuary where a given *patra*, a unit of the citizen body, conducts worship. Each god has the epithet *patroios* or *patroie* in addition to any ritual epithet, and the name of the *patra*, a patronymic form, is attached as a proprietary genitive. These *patrai* “fatherhoods” are equivalent to *phratriai* “brotherhoods.”⁴⁴ The sanctuary was very likely used for the homonymous festival *Apaturia* “Common-father-[rites],” a gathering of fictive “brothers” professing common “fathers.”⁴⁵ Another sanctuary next to this one seems to be a Thesmophorium used for festivals of Demeter.⁴⁶

Zeus *alastoros* has two markers, Zeus *ktesios* and Zeus unspecified have one each.⁴⁷ Athena *mykesie* has one marker, and Athena unspecified has two, Artemis *orthosia* has one, and Nymphs called

korades have one. The two *patrai* attached to Zeus *alastoros* are *Phastadai* and *Peleidai*. This reminds us of Zeus *elasteros* on Paros. One of the boundary markers there gives him the further title *patroios* (IG 12 Suppl. 208), and the altar belongs to “the descendants of *Mandrothemis*.” We see that the mother city has a similar organization and assigns the same role to Zeus *elasteros*.⁴⁸ The organization recurs once more at a colony of Thasos, Galepsus in Thrace. A boundary marker of “Zeus *herkeios patroios* and Zeus *ktesios*” evidently belongs to a *patra* that worships them both (SIG³ 991).⁵⁰

Now it is common to all these deities—to the full range on Thasos—that they originate in the household. Zeus *ktesios* “getter” (of property or provisions) is otherwise known only as a household god.⁵¹ Zeus *herkeios* “of the courtyard” is chiefly a household god.⁵² We may suppose that Zeus *alastoros* was once a household god as much as a public one, for this is plainly true of the widely attested Zeus *kataibates*.⁵³ As to Athena, she has a functional epithet only once, leaving us to suspect that she is the same in the two other cases. This is the hapax *μυκεσίη*, doubtless formed from *μύχος* in the sense of “inner chamber,” inasmuch as *μύχιος* is otherwise known as a household epithet comparable to e.g. *ktesios* and *herkeios* (Dion. Hal. 1.67.3).⁵⁴ As to Artemis and the Nymphs, they have epithets expressive of child-rearing, *ῥηθωσίη* and *κωράδες*, respectively; this is a concern proper to each household.⁵⁵

The upshot is that we find half a dozen household deities—deities otherwise diverse, related only in being serviceable to the household—presiding over the *patrai* of Thasos and before it of Paros and after it of Galepsus. Now at Athens the presiding deities of the *phratriai* are uniformly Zeus and Athena, and their epithets are uniformly *phratrios* and *phratia*.⁵⁶ The more diverse deities are presumably closer to the natural origins of the *Apaturia* as a festival shared by most Ionian cities (Hdt. 1.147.2).⁵⁷

The *patrai* serving Zeus *alastoros*—*Phastidai*, *Peleidai*, descendants of *Mandrothemis*—will be named for the distinctive ritual of the lightning god. The *patra* serving Zeus unspecified, *Neophantidai*, have a name similar to *Phastidai*; so this Zeus too is probably *alastoros*, the commonest of titles that he bears among the *patrai*.

Φαστάδαι and *Νεοφαντίδαι* are based respectively on the agent nouns **φάντης* “show-er”, cf. *φάσμα* “thing shown”, and **φάντης* “show-er”, a form familiar as the second element of several compounds. The two forms and their patronymics are equivalent. *φαίνω* “show” is a powerful word describing a powerful force of nature. Zeus the lightning god is spoken of as *σήματα φαίνων* “showing omens” (Il. 2.353 etc.). On Chios he is called with extra

emphasis *φαντήρ καταβάτης* “show-er, descender,” yet another form of the agent noun (SEG 17.406).⁵⁸ In a story to be mentioned below, Athens has a primordial king named Περίφωο “Greatly-showing” < περι + φα-; he rivals Zeus the lightning god and is therefore punished by a lightning strike.⁵⁹ The same name is also given to the grandfather of Ixion (Diod. 4.69.3), whose spectacular punishment is an image of the lighting. And on the Apulian amphora London F 331, depicting the sacrifice at the house of Oenomaus before his race with Pelops, “Periphas” is the caption for a suitor’s head that adorns the wall; the house as a ruin still standing at Olympia was famous for being struck by lightning.⁶⁰

Πηλεΐδαί “Peleus’ sons” are most likely named for a strange and memorable episode of the *Iliad*, Achilles’ encounter with *Asteropaios* “Lightningman,” in which “Peleus’ son” is narrowly victorious with the “Pelian ash” in a contest of spears, so that he boasts resoundingly of his kinship, through Peleus and Aeacus, with the god whose weapon is the lightning (21.136-99).⁶¹ The episode belongs to the *Mache parapotamios*, a counterpart to the *Theomachia*. Since Zeus himself is above the fray, his lightning can have effect only when transmuted into Achilles’ spear. *Peleidai* is not the only name drawn from epic tradition: the *patra* in charge of a household cult of Athena are *Priamidai* (see note 51).

We turn from Thasos to Paros, where a *patra* professes the ancestor *Μανδρόθεμης* “Law-of-Mandros.” Is he an actual person? *LGPN* I thinks so and dates him “oc. 500-480 b.c.” It is true that many ordinary names are compounds of the divine name *Mandros*, including the synonym *Μανδρόθεμης*. And it is true again that the nature of this Anatolian god has remained an enigma.⁶³ About the only clue is the fuller title *ἄσων ἄνδρος* “Burning *Mandros*” in a record of property purchased by his cult association at Cyme (*IvKyme* 37.5-6). It would suit a lightning god, however. And Pliny cites an authority on lightning similarly named *Zenothemis* “Law-of-Zeus” (*HN* 37.134). It is a pseudonym, and we shall infer as much for *Mandrothemis* as ancestor of a *patra* worshipping Zeus *elasteros*.

These proprietary cults of Zeus *elasteros* should be compared with others of Zeus *kataibates*. Thoricus honors “Zeus *kataibates* in [the domain] of” a certain kinship group whose name survives only in part:

ἐμ [. . . .] - / ἡμιδῶν (SEG 33.147 lines 25-26). Now the inscriber was sometimes careless, and the reading has hitherto been corrected

and restored as ἐμ [Φιλομ] - / ἡ <λ> ιδῶν on the grounds that a domain so called appears in mining records of the area.⁶⁴ This seems ill advised, for the name as it stands is easily completed. Whereas the preposition ἐμ shows that the first letter is a labial, the preserved remnant gives us a patronymic form based on a nine-letter name

ending with either -δημος or -σημος or -φημος. The first element is therefore Περι- or Πολυ- or Φιλο-. A lightning omen is σήμα, whence Zeus' epithet *σημάλεος* and the terms *Διοσημία*, *ἐχεσαμία*. We think of a name ending with -σημος.⁶² Attested names in -σημος (which of course need not always refer to lightning) are *Ἀρίσημος* / *Ἐρίσαμος*, *Εὐσαμος*, *Θεόσημος* / *Θεόσαμος* >. They are all quite rare; **Περίσημος*, **Πολύσημος*, **Φιλόσημος* would not surprise us more. Any of these produces a suitable patronymic for the kinship group who serve Zeus *kataibates*.

The inscription of Thalamae that prescribes an offering of barley meal to Zeus *kabatas* ends with the possessive genitive *Γαιήλω* “of *Gaihylos*” (IG 5.1.1316). In the form *Γαισύλος*, the name is recorded of a fourth-century Spartan (Plut. *Dion* 49.5-7). It seems to be well explained, though this has not been done, as Γαι(α)-συλος “Earth-spoiler,” an expressive name for the lightning and hence for the imaginary ancestor to whom the cult site is ascribed.⁶⁶ An ordinary Spartan might bear the name only because it is threatening.

Such then are the transparent names given to kinship groups in charge of the lightning god. Behind the transparent names we see the ritual. It is a general rule that a kinship group in charge of a given deity is named, mostly with the patronymic ending *-idai*, for the ritual—the magical scenario—that they perform. Chanting hierophants of Demeter are named for *Eumolpos* “Sweetsinger”; serenaders of Dionysus on his ship-wagon are named for *Euneos* “Good-ship”; quiet supplicants of the *Semnai Theai* are named for *Hesychos* “Quiet-man”; costumiers of the wooden image of Athena are named for *Praxiergus* “Do-the-job”; bearers of the *eiresiônê*, the “saving” bough, are named for *Erysichthôn* “Save-the-land.”

Now the ritual of the lightning god imitates the lightning itself. Our kinship groups are headed by *Phastês* “Show-er,” *Neophantes* “New Shower,” *Gaisylos* “Earth-spoiler”—actions that refer to the lightning god as he hurls the lightning. In the same way, certain kinship groups in charge of wind gods are named for a magical suspension of winds: *Heudanemoi* “Puttingwinds-to-sleep,” *Anemokoitai* “Putting-winds-to-bed.” The ritual of a wind god somehow soothes and lulls. That of a lightning god somehow blazes and strikes. Weather magic in general has a vast repertory of intense demonstrative actions.⁶⁷

The Ritual of the Lightning God

Thus prompted, what evidence of ritual can we find? Zeus the lightning god is worshipped throughout the Greek world with various epithets, none of them restricted to a particular dialect domain. Much

the commonest is *kataibatês* “descender.”⁶⁵⁶⁸ Others (besides *elasteros*) are *astrapaios*, *astrapatas*, *storpaios* referring to the flash, *brontaios* referring to the boom, *kerounos*, *kerounios*, *kerounobolos* referring to the strike.⁶⁹ As a further tribute the same epithets are very widely used in Anatolia and Syria for the lightning gods of immemorial antiquity whom we now recognize as e.g. Luwian or Hurrian or Semitic.⁷⁰

But in these many cults ancient practices were not typically maintained down to the time when they might be recorded for our notice. The very sparing mentions of ritual do not as a rule suggest anything but sacrifice and other offerings of a usual kind. Of ancient weather magic there were few survivals of note, and these are only reported indirectly. We must have recourse to aetiological myth or legend, which fancifully explains how some curious ritual action first occurred in some dramatic, unexpected way—and has been perpetuated ever since. Because the myth or legend was intended to regale interested observers, at least in the first instance, we hardly ever find the ritual described in its own right (Plutarch supplies an exception, noted below). As latecomers to the discussion, we can deduce the ritual only from the dramatic representation.

A story in Pausanias is of the simplest (8.53.10). Tegea was celebrating a certain festival of Zeus in a sanctuary on a hill when the Spartans attacked unexpectedly. It was snowing, and the Tegeans “lit a fire unbeknown to them,” and being thus restored they overcame the Spartans faint with cold. The festival, Pausanias has told us, honors Zeus κλάριος, whose epithet refers to the *klêros* “allotment” of Arcadian territory by the eponym Arcas; Tegea itself, he has also said, was divided into four tribes, the first of them named *Κλαρεῶτις* (8.4.3, 53.6, 9). Inscriptions of Tegea give the form *Κραριῶται* instead (IG 5.2.36, 39, 40), which entails the form **κράριος* for Zeus’ epithet and supersedes any notion of “allotment.” Since his sanctuary is located on a hill, the epithet is likely to be derived from *√κραρ* “peak.”⁷¹ As Nilsson saw long ago, even without the proper explanation of the epithet, this premier cult of Zeus is behind the “Olympian” games of Tegea known from a single inscription (IG 5.2.37).® Zeus is here called *μέγιστος καὶ κεραυνοβόλος*: it is the lightning god. His festival at Tegea was remarkable for a fire that was however hardly visible beyond the sanctuary. We reflect that a fire may simulate a lightning strike.

Next, the household cult. The story of Periphas king of Athens, which Antoninus Liberalis recounts in much abbreviated form after some Hellenistic author (Met. 6), is both a transformation story, giving us the eagle as king of birds, and an *aition* of certain Athenian cults of Zeus. Periphas with his great power and goodness is hailed by his

subjects as Zeus *sôter* and *epopsios* and *milichios*, making Zeus himself resentful. In the aforementioned cults Zeus is benign and helpful, but now he shows a different side. He resolves “to burn up [Periphas]’ whole house with lightning,” then relents somewhat and comes to the house unannounced, but finding Periphas and his wife in the conjugal act turns them into eagle and vulture. It is a matter of punishing a shameful sight; the conjugal act is so regarded in several lightning stories; more of this below. The house itself is spared, however, the occupants alone being punished: the original story will have ended explicitly with the household cult of Zeus the lightning god, matching those other cults. The graphic description of Zeus as “coming to the house of Periphas and catching him in bed with his wife, seizing him with both hands,” suggests that the cult epithet was the graphic *kataibatês*.

Another instance is altogether more rewarding. Clearchus of Soli tells a story to illustrate the wicked insolence and luxury of Tarentum; it turns on the household cult of Zeus *kataibatês*, which took a very strange form, at least by later standards (fr. 48 Wehrli = Ath. 12.23, 522d-f).⁷² At many houses in Tarentum, a *stêlê* of Zeus *kataibatês* stands in front of the door, and sacrifice is offered at a certain time of year to commemorate the death of persons belonging to these households.⁷³ They were all struck by lightning on one terrible occasion. Of course it did not happen at each house in Tarentum. It happened elsewhere, far away at the Iapygian town of Carbina, which Tarentum had seized and destroyed; it was divine punishment for abusing captives. This much seems almost routine. But the manner of abusing captives and hence of bringing down the lightning is extraordinary. The Tarentines “constructed booths in the holy places of Carbina and collected boys, girls, and young women, and exposed their bodies naked in the light of day for all to contemplate.” As the Tarentines gaped at them, they were struck by lightning. Hence the commemoration at each household *steêlêê*.

The horror here expressed of carnal nakedness is typical of many Greek lightning stories: to be naked draws the lightning.⁷⁴ But in this story, the naked spectacle is manufactured, and by machinery that is patently aetiological. The key words are *ἀθροίσαντες εἰς τὰ τῶν Καρβινάτων ἱερὰ σκηνοποιησάμενοι*: booths are constructed in holy places for some kind of display. The booths so constructed will belong to the cult of Zeus *kataibatês* at Tarentum that is Clearchus’ subject and the inspiration for the story. At each house, beside each *steêlêê*, the ritual of the season requires a booth. Each booth presents an appetizing sight—young naked bodies in Clearchus’ imagination—and irresistibly draws attention, even from the sky. “And anyone who wished, *just as if he were pouncing on a helpless flock*,

feasted his lubricious thoughts (καθάπερ εἰς ἀτυχῇ παραπηδῶν ἀγέλην, θοινᾶτο ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις) upon the lovely bloom of the assembled persons—everyone was looking, but especially those least expected, the gods. The divine power so resented it that he thunderbolted all the Tarentines who offended in Carbina.”⁷⁵ Booths, feasts, a lightning strike. We recall that a lightning strike may be simulated by fire, and we reflect further that a booth will serve both to display a feast and to catch fire.

The final instance, as well as the most instructive, is Plutarch’s description of a certain Delphic custom: the ritual itself is described exactly, in order to refute the aetiologies that pass current. At Delphi, with its priesthood devoted to theology, three strange festivals of the distant past, each without obvious parallel, were conducted down to the time of Plutarch on a supposedly ancient eight-year cycle: *Septēria*, *Hêrūis*, and *Charila*?⁷⁶ The first of these was the best known by far.⁷⁷ It was said to reenact Apollo’s slaying of Python, the marvelous geste with which his worship begins (even the Pythian Games, even the Pythian musical contest, were said to recall Apollo’s slaying of Python). Just how strained this interpretation is Plutarch shows by recounting the ritual in detail. Its true affinity waits to be ascertained; modern scholars have not done so yet.

A booth, called either σκηνή (Strabo, in another helpful reference) or καλιὰς (Plutarch), is constructed on a piece of level ground called the *halos* “threshing floor,” south of Apollo’s temple and beside the processional way that mounts to the temple. It is somehow grandiose —μίμημα τυραννικῆς ἢ βασιλικῆς ἐστὶν οἰκήσεως “it is an imitation of a king’s or a tyrant’s residence” (Plutarch).⁷⁸ A table is loaded with food. Processioners go along the road up to the booth. They carry burning torches, and set fire to the booth and overturn the table, and run away without looking back, out through the gate at the bottom of the processional way.

The explanation of the ritual in several competing versions is that Apollo hereby kills Python (as if setting fire to the booth is shooting arrows at a snake) and must therefore be purified of the guilt of murder (as if the splendid geste is a case of homicide). For his statutory exile Apollo flees to the vale of Tempe with its laurel, so that laurel as Apollo’s emblem commemorates the slaying—witness the *theoëria* from Delphi to Thessaly, and other Apolline customs.⁷⁹ All this is a coda to the serpent-slaying of the festival, which itself is no part of Apollo’s worship. Rather, the idea of being purified from overwhelming guilt, as of homicide, points straight to Zeus, god of suppliants and of purification.⁸⁰ We have then a festival of Zeus, and its rite of purification has inspired the rigmarole of how Apollo slew Python at the booth, as if it were a homicide.

The festival name Σεπτήρια is unique, as are the two other festival names of the eight-year cycle; like them it was conferred so as to set Delphi apart. It is formed from *σεπτήρ, agent noun of σεβω “revere.”⁸¹ “Revering [rites]” again point straight to Zeus and his dreadful lightning. Famous scenes from Homer onward evoke them both with the words *σέβω*, *σέβας* “reverence,” *σεμνός* “reverend.”

Telemachus remarks the *steropêê* “flashing” of precious metal and other materials in the palace of Menelaus, and can only think of the palace of Zeus on Olympus, and exclaims, “*Sebas* comes over me” (Od. 4.71-75). In the Homeric *Hymn to Athena* the goddess springs with flashing arms and armor from the head of Zeus, itself *semne*, so that “*sebas* came over all the gods as they looked on” (H. 28.4-7).⁸² Homer, in requesting passage from Erythrae to Chios, calls on a ship’s crew to respect the *sebas* of Zeus; when they do not, a sudden storm arises and enforces the lesson (*Vit. Hom.* 19). Feckless Neoptolemus swears by “the holy *sebas* of highest Zeus” (Soph. *Phil.* 1289). Prometheus, soon to be smitten by the lightning, is ominously warned, “instead of fearing Zeus, you *revere* (σέβῃ) mortals too much” (*Prom. Vincit.* 543-44).

Such is Delphi’s festival of the lightning god. Plutarch describes the entire ritual sequence, of which we had only glimpses before. A booth of grand appearance is constructed, and a table within is loaded with food; suddenly, the construction is set alight by torches; as the fire rages, people run away as if in awe. With the complete picture before us, we recognize the interlocking pieces elsewhere. At Tarentum, in the household worship of Zeus *kataibateês*, booths are constructed that typify wanton luxurious display—we owe it to Clearchus’ imagination that the spectacle consists of naked boys, girls, and women. The lightning strike that ensues is more truly a fire that consumes each booth at each household. At Athens, a household cult of Zeus is traced back to a king on whose house Zeus suddenly descended, not indeed to consume the house with fire, for Zeus changed his mind at the last minute, but rather to make him the universal emblem of the lightning, an eagle. Each Athenian household must have staged a lightning strike, as at Tarentum. At Tegea, during the festival of Zeus later styled *keranobolos*, a fire is lit all at once in the sanctuary; it is a public observance, as at Delphi.

Plutarch does not know the true meaning of the *Septeria*. But he refutes some mistaken notions of his own day, and we must not fall back on modern ones. It is common enough, both in the ancient world and in later folkways, to construct a pyre of timber, to heap offerings on it, and to watch everything go up in a great conflagration. The leading instances in Greece belong to deities as diverse as Artemis, Hera, and Heracles.⁸³ They should not be lumped together as a class

of “fire festivals” so as to suggest a widespread custom with a common purpose.⁸⁴ The magic purposes will be as diverse as the presiding deities. In no other case does the pyre take the form of a booth, nor is there a table of food, nor do people run away when the fire is lit.

What of the ritual that Selinus prescribes for an *elasteros*? There are detailed instructions for the table of food. One lays out a full meal: supping and salt and meat from a piglet sacrificed to Zeus, together with the means of washing one’s hands. It is not indeed an opulent meal, for the whole purpose is to enlist persons of lesser means in ritual that they could not manage otherwise. The scanty table seems to have caused misgiving, inasmuch as a larger sacrifice at a public altar is envisaged in lines added later. Beforehand the *elasteros* in question is carefully invited, and afterwards the worshipper takes his leave emphatically. Other elements are lacking because they are impractical. A booth is not constructed, and without it a fire cannot be set. After all, the location is neither a person’s house nor a shrine but some perhaps remote place of his own choosing.

The Lightning Season

Just when is it that the lightning god is worshipped by the household or by the city? The question seems not to have been asked, much less answered. Instead, it is often suggested that a cult at a given place commemorates an actual lightning strike.⁸⁵ Conversely, it is held that the sites called *νηλοσια*, which do mark an actual lightning strike, are sacred to Zeus *kataibatês*. Ancient lexicons s.v. can be cited for this proposition, but it is only fanciful.⁸⁶ Now if the cults did commemorate a lightning strike, they would do so on the anniversary. No such custom is evident. In Clearchus’ account of Tarentum, it is merely the way of aetiology to say that sacrifice is offered *καθ’ ὃν ἀπώλοντο χρόνον* “at the time when they perished” (Ath. 12.23, 522f). Since this is a household cult with a private sacrifice at each *steêleê*, there was probably no appointed day for the observance, no festival of households as it were, only a season or a month. The phrase quoted suggests as much, vague as it is. The usual phrase for a commemorative rite is *ἥ (ἡμέραι) κτλ* “on the day that,” etc.

The answer to our question is that the lightning god will be worshipped when lightning is either feared or desired—like any weather, we trust that lightning will be either averted or elicited by the proper ritual.⁸⁷ Lightning and ensuing heavy rain are greatly feared in late summer and autumn for the damage they can bring to the ripening tree crops. Lightning and ensuing heavy rain are urgently desired at the very end of autumn, when the protracted effort of plowing and sowing is finally over, and wet weather is needed all at

once for the germinating grain. The calendar evidence for the lightning god bears this out. Though not abundant, it is straightforward. All datable observances fall between late summer and the end of autumn.

Athens and Attica supplicate Zeus *kataibatês* on behalf of the olive. Olives ripen from August to November, when they are harvested. At Thoricus Zeus *kataibatês* is honored first in *Metageitnion* = August and then in *Pyanopsion* = October (*SEG* 33.147 lines 10-12, 25-26).⁸⁸ At the Academy, with its grove of sacred olives, Zeus *kataibatês* has an altar beside Athena's shrine and is himself called *morios* in virtue of the olives (Apollodorus *FGrH* 244 F 120 = Σ Soph. *Oed. Col.* 705). Athena's "victory" over Poseidon and her gift of the olive are celebrated at the beginning of the season, in the *Niketeria* "victory rites" of 2 *Boedromion* = September (Plut. *De frat. amor.* 18, 489b, *Quaest. conv.* 9.6, 741b, cf. Procl. *Tim.* 53d).⁸⁹ The west pediment of the Parthenon shows the victory scene, also copied on vases; it has been thought to show Athena and Poseidon both recoiling from a lightning bolt that Zeus flings between them.⁹⁰ It may be that lightning omens were especially observed as olives ripened, to be answered by sacrifice as appropriate. There was also an *abaton* of Zeus *kataibatês* on the Acropolis (*IG* 2² 4964-65), and a shameful incident occurred beside it in 304 b.c., sometime in the autumn, when Demetrius the Besieger had just arrived in Athens.⁹² In dismounting from his horse he was hailed as "Zeus *descender*"—it was the time for invoking the god.

The festival that we saw at Tegea and Delphi can be assigned to the end of autumn, when rain and hence lightning are welcome; it is why the ritual simulates the lightning. At Tegea the story evokes the season by feigning that a fire was lit just because of the snow and cold. At Delphi the month of November is named for the proud old festival we have examined—though the month name differs again. The name *Septeria* was itself unique, like the names of the other two old festivals. The month names of the Delphian calendar are also, or most of them, unique in avoiding any obvious festival nomenclature and in coining names that are somehow descriptive.⁹³ So it is with November, named $\Delta\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\phi\acute{o}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ for $\ast\Delta\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\phi\omicron\rho\iota\alpha$ "Torch-bearing [rites]." Nilsson thought of Maenads with torches, flinging about on Parnassus, and almost everyone has followed him.⁹¹ November would be early for this winter festival of Dionysus; it mostly comes in January.⁹⁵ In any case, "Torch-bearing [rites]" are undoubtedly a processional "torch-bearing," like other festivals in $-\phi\omicron\rho\iota\alpha$ named for stately processions; Maenads cannot be so described. In our festival, processioners "with burning torches," $\acute{\eta}\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \delta\alpha\iota\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu$, go solemnly along the Sacred Way to the threshing floor and its flammable booth.

As an occasion exalted by Delphic theology it gives the name of the “Torchbearing” month.

And now we should add another festival to the dossier, a festival that was once very common indeed. The *Μαιμακτήρια* “Raging [rites]” are a festival of Zeus that gives its name to the month of November in not a few Ionian and Aeolian calendars and is itself uniquely attested on Thasos.⁹⁶ At Athens and on Naxos Zeus is called *μαϊμάκτης* (Harp. s. *Μαιμακτηριών*, *IG* 12.5.47). At Mytilene a dedication is addressed to *Μαιμακτῆρες*, a group of powers of the same kind (*IG* 12.2.70). Yet the terminology is barely noticed in Greek literature (Lysimachides *FGrH* 366 F2, Plut. *De cohib. ira* 9, 458c). The nouns and adjective *μαϊμάκτης*, *μαϊμακτῆρ*, *μαϊμακτῆριος* are agent forms of the verb *μαίμω*, itself a frequentative or possibly causative form of *μαίω*.⁹⁴ In the *Iliad* this old verb mostly has the secondary meaning “burn with eagerness.” It is said of literal fire, however, that it ἀναμαίμει “rages through” a wood (Il. 20.440). The glosses *μαίμαξ*, *μαίμακος*, *μαϊμάχης*, and indeed Zeus’ epithet *μαϊμάκτης* are all said to mean “violent” or the like. A word meaning literally “burn” and figuratively “rage” is appropriate to the lightning god, uniquely so. In early days Zeus was worshipped everywhere for the lightning and the rain of winter that are as indispensable as the summer sun. But this great festival afterwards disappeared, except at Delphi.

In sum, Zeus the lightning god dominates the sky from August to November for two successive reasons: lightning signals danger for the olive and other autumn crops but abundance for the staple crop of grain. Throughout the whole season Zeus has willed it that the lightning shows his purpose. There are statistics of a kind, fittingly supplied by the Royal Observatory under King Otto and King George. The frequency of lightning episodes in the sky at Athens, mostly the northern sky, was recorded for each month of the year during the years 1859–1870.⁹⁸ Over the whole period, the totals for every month from December through May are lower, mostly much lower, than the totals for every month from June to November. The highest totals are for June (67), August (59), October (63), and November (54). “On the night of August 30, 1862, about 56,000 lightning flashes were counted in the course of four hours.”

Another point should be noted in the calendar evidence: the worship of the lightning god is sometimes conducted on a grander scale every four years, in the year of the Olympic Games. The Olympic Games of late summer inaugurate the lightning season in the sky, just as they inaugurate the rule of Zeus as successor to the Mother’s partner *Kronos* (see chapter 5, pp. 80–81).

The Tegean festival of Zeus *keranobolos* is styled “Olympic” in

the inscription that lists the victors in a program of games (IG 5.2.37): in an Olympic year it was celebrated with games, and in other years without them. At Thalamae barley meal is to be offered *πέμπτοι φέτει* “in the fourth year,” which is naturally taken as an Olympic year (IG 5.1.1316).⁹⁹ A fourth- yearly observance may be suspected at Athens too, in the cult of Zeus *kataibatês* appearing in the civic calendar of c. 400 b.c. (fr. 10 B 3, *Ἀὐ κα[τα]ιβάτει*, restored by Dow).⁹⁷¹⁰⁰ The entry is one of those in Attic letters that are conformable with cycles other than annual.¹⁰¹ The incident mentioned above, when Demetrius the Besieger was hailed as Zeus *kataibateês*, occurred in 304 b.c., an Olympic year.

The “Olympian Zeus” who gives his name to the Panhellenic site of Olympia is therefore none other than the lightning god. The Olympic festival of late summer accords with the usual lightning worship at this time. After all, Olympia could only adopt a cult that was familiar otherwise, and in early days the god who wields the lightning was an impressive figure. Other cults of the lightning god followed suit, marking the Olympic cycle. And Delphi paid the tribute of imitation by adopting the lightning festival of late autumn for its rival Pythian cycle.

Turning to Selinus and column B of the tablet, we see how the lightning season does duty for half the year. To recapitulate, the manner of displaying the tablet with one column upside down while the other is right side up indicates that the two periods in question are equal but opposite. Column A is before us, at a minimum, from early spring to the summer solstice, for such is the time span of the prescribed ritual. If the two columns together take up the whole year, it is feasible to suppose that column A is displayed from the winter solstice to the summer solstice. Column B will be displayed from the summer solstice to the winter solstice.

In prescribing rites for a nameless power of lightning (and nothing else), column B leaves the time entirely open: “whenever in the year [a person] wishes and in whatever month he wishes and on whatever day he wishes.” But a person will be prompted thus for only half the year, from July to December. Most of it, from August to November, is the lightning season. Furthermore, the rites for a nameless power of lightning require sacrifice to the high god Zeus, whether it takes place at some impromptu site or at his public altar in the center of the city. In either case the tablet invents a peculiar mode of sacrifice, at once looking up to the sky and down to the earth, which is expressive of the lightning. So Zeus the lightning god is present to one’s mind. He was even suggested by the general heading for the ritual of column A, since the Olympic truce as a terminus points to his reign thereafter.

The reason why Selinus' tablet fixes on a nameless power of lightning is not that Zeus the lightning god was less accustomed here. We may be sure that in the mid-fifth century Selinus had both household cults and public observances extending to the two great festivals of August and November. It is rather that Zeus does not suit the purpose, being much too grand. The several deities of column A are chosen from a wider range, and Demeter *malophoros* was likewise much too grand. In both columns the ritual is modest, being contrived for everyman. During the lightning season the only alternative is a nameless power of lightning. There were many such; this too was a common belief.

Usener devoted a famous essay to personified *keraunos* and similar instances as an ever-recurring belief.¹⁰² But often we cannot know what power is meant, Zeus or a lesser one. That the Greeks acknowledged a multitude of nameless powers besides Zeus is shown by two instances in Pausanias and by the vivid role that Hesiod assigns to the *Kykloêpes* as Zeus' subordinates. It is only to be expected. The Olympian gods have charge of this or that department of nature, within which particular forces of nature are expressed by epithets for each Olympian. But such forces are represented also by lesser deities existing beside the Olympians, singly or in groups of three or more or as collectivities indefinitely large. They are typically anonymous; individual names are always secondary.

One of Pausanias' instances is as indefinite as an *elasteros*. At Bathos in Arcadia "they sacrifice to lightnings and storm winds and thunders"—to ἀστραπαο, θεολλαί, βρονταο (8.29.1). Pausanias does not mean that these forces of nature are the object of cult, with sacrifice at stated times.¹⁰³ They would then have been consolidated to the extent of receiving names. Rather, sacrifice is offered when such forces threaten, perhaps when something is "heard" or "seen," as at Selinus. Nearby was an intermittent spring ("not flowing every second year") and some kind of fire flaring up from the earth.¹⁰⁴ The place was chosen for sacrifice because of natural features associated with storms.

At the Isthmus, says Pausanias again, "there is an ancient shrine called 'altar of the *Kyklopes*,' and on it they sacrifice to the *Kyklopes*" (2.2.1).¹⁰⁵ This permanent facility is needed at a meeting place of voyagers for whom the powers of storm are always of concern. The *Kykloêpes* are invoked as an indistinct plurality, for otherwise Pausanias would mention the individual names (such as those of Hesiod). A shrine that Pausanias calls "ancient" (ἀρχαίου) probably existed in the sixth century b.c., the period of the *Titanomachia* of Eumelus, poet of Corinth and of the Isthmus too. For a certainty, his subject required mention of the *Kyklopes*. But the account he gave of

battle with the Titans differed from Hesiod's, and two of the three names that the *Kykloêpes* bear in Hesiod, *Steropeê* and *Bronteê*, are reassigned to the mares of Helios (fr. 7 Bernabe = 4b Davies).¹⁰⁶ Eumelus, like the Isthmus shrine, must have left the *Kykloêpes* unnamed, perhaps as a virtual *aition*.

In Hesiod's *Theogony* the triad of *Kyklopes* personify the lightning with the expressive names *Steropêês*, *Brontes*, *Arges* differentiating sight and sound (13946, 501-6). The triad of "Hundred-handers," another expressive name, personify the wind that hurls and pummels (chapter 11, pp. 177-78). Zeus recruits them both for battle and incorporates them both in his permanent dispositions. Though Hesiod is heir to Eastern stories in which the same natural forces are recruited and incorporated by other weather gods, these are Greek names for Greek notions of lightning and of wind.¹⁰⁷ How then—with what expressive meaning—does the name ἀάκλωπειο denote the lightning?

The *Kyklopes* have a single eye in the middle of the forehead, we are told in four lines both pleonastic and jejune (*Theog.* 142-45). So do Homer's *Kyklopes* (*Od.* 1.69-71 etc.), completely different but for the same physiognomy. And whereas Homer, in speaking of a one-eyed ogre in a cave, keeps company with storytellers round the world, he alone gives us a bucolic one-eyed race to which the one-eyed ogre happens to belong. It should be obvious that Homer arrogated Hesiod's *Kyklopes* by way of punning on their name and that the text of the *Theogony* was adjusted in consequence.¹⁰⁸ Homer and the adjusted *Theogony* take the name as "Circle-eyed," i.e. "One-eyed," to which there are several further objections. (1) "Circle-eyed" is *not* tantamount to "one-eyed," and (2) the old word κύκλος originally means "wheel," a concrete sense, with "circle" as a secondary sense, more general and abstract, and (3) the second element -ωψ, -ωπες originally means "-appearing" and means "-eyed" only in later, doubtful interpretations, and (4) the one eye of both Homer's and Hesiod's *Kyklopes* puzzled ancient commentators, and (5) it was avoided in ancient art.¹⁰⁹

The true meaning of *Kyklopes* is "Wheel-appearing," i.e. fiery wheels rolling through the sky. It is an image that caps the moral story of Ixion.¹¹⁰ This archetypal sinner is bound forever to a spinning fiery wheel, a warning to those who understand. Before the moral story, "Wheel-appearing" was a name for every power of lightning, as "Hundred-hander" was for every force of wind. When the Eastern story of the Succession in Heaven was taken up in Greek poetry, both names were applied to notional triads allied with the weather god. The name *Kyklops* testifies to a belief in powers as numerous or frequent as the *elasteros* of Selinus.

1. JJK 40, 54–56, 116–20. Fullest since are Dubois (1995a, 560–61; 1995b, 138–39), Kotansky (1995, 24748), Clinton (1996, 174–75, 179), Arena (1997, 436–37), Giuliani (1998, 81–86), Burkert (1999, 30–32; 2000, 208–9), Johnston (1999, 47–49).

2. JJK 116–17, Matthaiou (1998, 1999).

3. JJK 117. In the Parian alphabet the word appears as ἀλαστώρω (genitive).

4. JJK 117n43 are against it.

5. S. Marinatos in 1951 “perceived that Zeus *elasteros* was a chthonic god of vengeance,” say JJK 117 as if to clinch the matter, after transcribing the inscriptions of Paros. But others whom they cite for comment did not perceive it (Nilsson, Chantraine, van Effenterre).

6. Dyck (1989, 2) says of the first instance that “the hard oxymoron is much more likely to be Aeschylean than the result of scribal error.” Scribal error, however, is readily explained by the likeness of *Eum.* 236.

7. For ἀλήτορα Taplin (1977, 378n4) proposes to read ἀλήτορα with the meaning “wanderer,” appealing to Hesychius’ gloss ἀλήτωρ· ἱερεύς. Neither the meaning nor the postulated corruption seems at all plausible.

8. “It is very unlikely that two such unusual words had been conjoined at another point, and one can hardly see how someone who is *alastor* can be called *preumenes*”: Radt *ad* Aesch. fr. 92a*.

9. So Nauck¹ on his fr. 92. He had earlier supplied καὶ Εὐμενίσι>. Nauck did not mean to plant the form ἀλάστορον in the text of Aeschylus, as Burkert (2000, 208, 215n8) supposes; he was entirely skeptical of the form.

10. Dyck (1989, 1–2).

11. It is very trusting to say, as Dyck does, that the person *alastor* and the epithet of Zeus are “two apt examples” of metaplasm.

12. The ἵνα clause of Ant. 970–76 contains nine expressive words beginning with ἀ-, a remarkable alliteration. ἀλάστορος might almost be a momentary coinage.

13. They are treated as secondary forms by Frisk, *GEW* s. ἀλάστορος and by Chantraine, *DELG* s. ἀλάστωρ; both regard the epithet as unrelated (see note 15). ἀλάστορος in Sophocles and ἀλαστορία are in fact passed over by JJK.

14. λέγεται δ’ ὑπό τινων καὶ ἀλάστωρ ...
τῶι τοῦς ἀλάστορας ... κολάζειν (Corn. ND 9).
δαίμονα κικλήσκω ... πολὺπλαγκτον (!) ἀλάστορα κτλ
(*H. Orph.* 73.1–3). Cf. Hsch. s. ἀλάστωρ, Phot. s. παλαμναῖος.

15. So Frisk *apud* Nilsson (1951. 163–64) and again in *GEW* s. Ἐλάστερος, and Chantraine, *DELG* s. Ἐλάστερος, ἐλαύνω. Frisk discusses the formation of the word very fully but not the sense of ἐλαύνω, nor does Nilsson, who merely notes that the Thasian cults belong to kinship groups. N. M. Kontoleon, in first publishing two ἐλάστερος inscriptions, thought of a compound of ἐλαύνω and ἀστήρ

16. JJK 117, Dubois (1995b, 138), Burkert (2000, 208).

17. Such meanings were proposed for the epithet on Paros by Marinatos, as cited by JJK 117, and adopted for both Paros and Thasos by Rolley (1965, 455–56).

18. Schwyzer, *Gr. Gram.* 1.306 (ἄλαστος), 531 (ἄλάστωρ), Frisk, *GEW* s. ἄλαστος with *addenda*. Chan- traine, *DELG* s. ἄλάστωρ.

19. *Lfgre* s. ἐλαύνω I 2 a β. So Zenodotus; Aristarchus substituted ἔλας < εἶλω only to enforce his own doctrine of ἐλαύνω (cf. Hainsworth on *Od.* 5.132).

20. So Usener (1905, 490–91), Blinkenberg (1911, 50–57), Wilamowitz (1931, 213), F. Wüst, *RE* 22.1 (1953) 478–79 s. Poseidon. Contra, Nilsson (1955, 446n1) (“although Poseidon often brings storm and clouds, he never ever hurls the lightning,” *amere petitio principii*), E. Simon, *LIMC* 7 (1994) s. Poseidon (no mention of the matter). The place on the Acropolis where the trident struck Erechtheus was left open to the sky, a lightning superstition (for the location, which is *not* the north porch of Athena’s Ionic temple, see Robertson [1996c, 37–44]).

21. *Lfgre* s.v. I 2, *LSJ* s.v. II.

22. Both Frisk, *GEW* s.v. and Chantraine, *DELG* s.v. fail to mention the meaning “strike” beside “drive,” even as they conclude that the stem ζλα- is without etymology. There is accordingly another general direction in which to look.

23. Nisbet and Hubbard *ad loc.* cite Pindar but also speak of “popular belief” and refer to Porphyrio’s comment that “thunder-claps are said to be the rumbling of Jupiter’s chariot and team.” The popular belief here is probably weather magic. A rumbling wagon served to bring rain at Crannon in Thessaly, and in an aetiological story Salmoneus’ rumbling chariot mocks the weather god by emulation. The origin of Horace’s image is however purely literary.

24. Hes. *Theog.* 689–93, 699, 707–8, Eur. *Heracles* 177–80, etc. *LIMC* 4.1, 1988, 255 s. Gigantes (F. Vian, M. B. Moore).

25. Titans: Str. bk. 7 frs. 38–40 on Παίονες = Πελαγόνες and on Asteropaëus son of the eponym Πηλεγών, ending with καὶ οἱ Τιτᾶνες ἐκλήθησαν Πελαγόνες. Giants: schol. Callim. *Hymn to Zeus* 3. τῶν γιγάντων· παρὰ τὸ ἐκ πηλοῦ γενέσθαι, τούτέστι τῆς γῆς; Et. Gen. s. Πηλαγόνες· οἱ γίγαντες· Καλλίμαχος; Suda s. Πηλαγόνος· ὄνομα γίγαντος. A nuanced view: Suda s. Πηλαγόνες· γέροντες, παλαιοί, γηγενεῖς.

26. Bernabe’s fr. 318 is a compendium of references to the blasting of the Titans.

27. Lobeck (1829, 1.569) illustrates the use of ἐλαύνεσθαι “bandy” (*exagitari*).

28. Gruppe (1906, 1111Π3) gives a long list; H. Schwabl, *RE Suppl.* 15 (1978) 1018 s. Zeus one not quite so long.

29. As in the stories of Antiope and Semele. Both are linked with cult sites that possibly belong to Zeus *kataibates*. The *abatōn* on the Cadmeia with its ever-burning fire is suitable—Dodds on Eur. *Bacch.* 6–12 mentions Zeus *kataibates* as a comparandum. At Eleutherae, besides the story of Antiope, we hear of Zeus and lightning flashes in three labored aetiologies that Plutarch drew from antiquarian literature (*Quaest. Gr.* 39, 300 A–C).

30. Guarducci (1970, 252–55).

31. JJK 117n43. Schwabl, *RE* 10A (1972) 270–73 s. Zeus lists the known

epithets so beginning, and none of them can be thought of here. JJK suggest an epithet like Athena's *ἀνεμῶτις* but why would two prosaic words repeat the same idea? In any case, JJK's objection to *ἀλ[αστόρο]*, that it is oddly combined with fair winds, holds only for their conception of the word.

32. Cordano (1993, 149–53) argues unconvincingly, after Arena, that the epithet is *ῥίριος* rather than *οὔριος*.

33. *IG* 2² 1358 = Lambert (2000a, 45–48) A col. 1 lines 9–11. Lambert restores the numeral, or rather either one. Cf. chapter 11, p. 174.

34. The end of the threshing is celebrated in the demes by Demeter's festival *Skira*, in the city by the Acropolis procession *Skirophoria*. See Robertson (2004, 121–22) and chapter 13, pp. 206–11.

35. JJK 116–17, a-d; Matthaïou (1998, 424–26 nos. 1–2) (1 = d); cf. Matthaïou (1999).

36. = *LSCG Suppl.* 62 = Guarducci 1967, 161–62 = JJK 116–17, a.

37. JJK 72–73, 117.

38. This is the reading and interpretation of Nilsson (1908b), adopted and elaborated by Cook (1925, 17–20).

39. Cook (1925, 18–19n6) illustrates the use, starting with Odysseus' conjuring the dead (*Od.* 10.520).

40. That the epithet refers to the lightning is generally agreed, with the meaning “flying down” < πετ-/ *πτωτ-*, cf. *πτωτάομαι*. There is other evidence for the lightning god in the vicinity, cited by Frazer *ad loc.* and more fully by Cook (1940, 939–42).

41. Rolley (1965, 441–42 no. I, 445–46 no. 4).

42. Rolley (1965, 458–62), Jones (1987, 184–86).

43. Rolley (1965, 452–63).

44. Rolley (1965, 468–83).

45. Zeus *ktesios* belongs to the *Anchialidai*, and Zeus unspecified to the *Neophantidai*: Rolley (1965, 442–45 nos. 2–3). A stele inscribed “of Zeus *ktesios patroios*” was found long ago in a late context near the agora: *IG* 12 *Suppl.* 407, adduced and illustrated by Rolley (1965, 454–55).

46. So Salviat (1958, 220). The point is not distinctly made by Rolley (1965, 455), and Paros does not appear among “the Ionian Kyklades” in Jones (1987).

47. Cf. Salviat (1958, 220). Galepsus too should be added to Jones (1987) under “Thrace.”

48. Nilsson (1908a; 1938, 161–63; 1955, 403–5), Sjövall (1931, 53–74).

49. Nilsson (1938, 161; 1955, 402–3), Sjövall (1931, 7–48).

50. Nilsson (1908b; 1955, 72–73), Sjövall (1931, 108–14).

51. Rolley (1965, 456–57) argues the etymology at length, citing also *Νυμφέων μυχιέων* in a contemporary inscription of Naxos (*IG* 12.5.53)

and the deities *Μύχιος* and *Μυχία* at Mytilene (*IG* 12.2.484 line 13, Roman period). (But Athena's epithet goes unmentioned in Frisk, *GEW* and Chantraine, *DELG* s.v. *μυχος*.) The *patra* in charge of Athena *mykesie* are *Priamidai*: in the epic tradition Priam's palace and family are an ideal household, and Athena on the citadel of Troy is their household goddess.

52. Rolley (1965, 457–58) illustrates the background of Artemis and of the Nymphs to like effect, adducing the *Nymphai genethliai* of Phalerum, whose epithet is reckoned a household one by Dionysius in the passage cited. And we have just discovered Nymphs, like Athena, “in the inner chamber” (see note 51). As to Artemis

ὀρθωσίη, “the goddess' main function was probably to set children straight on their feet” (Parker [1996, 321], with reference to a proprietary cult at Athens).

53. At Athens, this uniform style was perhaps first required when the festival *Synokia* “[Rites]-of-the- combined-oikoi” was created as a civic reunion of all the phratries, during which the two deities received a single token offering from a tribe and a *trittys*, *Gleontis* and *Leukotainioi*, who presumably led all the rest: *SEG* 52.48 A fr. 3 lines 47–51, Lambert’s republication of the civic calendar.

54. As to the names of the Thasian *patrai*, Jones (1987, 185) speaks of their “patently late and fictional content.” But the names are not different in kind from the universal fiction of kinship groups in Greek cities.

55. The Chian inscription is republished by Graf (1985, 435 no. 12).

56. Periphas is condignly metamorphosed into an eagle, the universal storm bird. Forbes Irving (1990, 237) cites several unconvincing interpretations of the name and adds yet another, that Periphas = *περιφανος* as “an appropriate name for an eagle.”

57. = *LIMC* Periphas 11. The ruin may well have been that of Olympia’s earliest temple (chapter 5, p. 72).

58. *Asteropaïos*’ father *Πηλεγών* is eponym of the Thracian *Πελαγονές* (see note 25). and the aforementioned Apulian vase labels another mounted head as *Πελάγων* (*LIMC* Pelagon I), a name included also in the extended list of suitors at Paus. 6.21.10 = [Hes.] fr. 259 M-W. Note that a basic meaning “strike” is sometimes postulated for the stem of *πέλας* and kindred verbs: Frisk, *GEW* and Chantraine, *DELG* s.v.

59. *LGPN* I records *Mandrodikos* 1) at Minoa on Amorgos, *Mandrodikos* 2) at Eresus on Lesbos. *Mandrodikos* 1, moreover, is father of *Pasithemis*, disclosing a belief no less devout than that of the *patra*.

60. H. Engelmann on *IvKyme* 37 makes it a question whether *Kaion Mandros* is “a god of fire or of the hearth” and rejects the former as implying Persian influence, which came too late for *Anaximandros*, born in c. 610. Citing the Greek word *μάνδρα*, which means “fold, pen,” and finding a “bucolic” aspect in the cult association, he thinks rather of a god who helped shepherds with their fires. But the occurrences of the Greek word do not point to a background in Anatolia, nor does the existence of the Sanskrit word *mandura* with the same meaning, first noted by Fick. The god *Mandros* is unrelated.

61. Daux (1983) (= *SEG* 33.147), 165–66; cf. Parker (1987, 144). Labarbe (1977, 61) rejects the restoration but suggests nothing else.

62. A name in *-φήμος < φήμη* is not so apt. Zeus has the epithets *φήμιος*, *πανομφαίος* at Erythrae and similar epithets as glosses, but the reference is to *kledones* as at Dodona: K. Latte, *RE* 18.1 (1939) 829–31.

63. Zeus *kabatas* is named in the genitive at the beginning, and the several interpretations of *Gaihulo* canvassed by Cook (1925, 18n3) make this another epithet. But the order of words would be strange indeed.

64. Fiedler (1931), a dissertation of the school of F. Pfister, is a brave attempt to classify them.

65. The full range is as follows. Ionian: Athens, Thoricus, Paros, Thasos, Chios, Miletus, Didyma. Dorian: Thalamae, Olympia, Melos, Thera, Cos town, Halasarna, Rhodian *Peraia*, Tarentum. Thessalian: Pelinnaeum, Pharcadon, Pythium in Perrhaebia. For most of these, see Schwabl, *RE* 10A (1972) 322 s. Zeus (epithets) or, with additions, Schwabl, *RE Suppl.* 15 (1978) s. Zeus (sites). Add *SEG* 33.147 = 37.105 etc. (Thoricus), 40.683 (Halasarna), 43.296, 562 (Pharcadon, Cos town).

66. *Astrapaïos* etc.: Athens, Tegea, Antandros, Cameirus. *Brontaios*: Cyzicus. *Keraunos* etc.: Mantinea, Tegea, Olympia, Elasson, Pergamum, Priene, Thasos, Mytilene, Calymna, Melos. See Schwabl, *RE* 10A (1972) 282, 292–93, 322–23, 360 under each epithet.

67. Schwabl, *RE Suppl.* 15 (1978) 1151–73 (Anatolia), 1175–79 (Syria). In the usual spirit of Greek chauvinism, we are told that Seleucus *nikator* introduced the noble figure of Zeus *kataibates* to his kingdom. But modern specialists have turned the tables by showing that the winged horse Pegasus, a native of Anatolia who carries thunderbolts for Zeus, is in origin the Luwian lightning god *Pihassassi*: Haas (1994, 326), Hutter (2003, 269–70).

68. So Jost (1985, 271), after Solmsen and Adler.

69. Nilsson (1906, 4–5). Jost (1985, 270–71) is however at pains to separate the two cults.

70. Giannelli (1963, 30–31) holds that the cult of Zeus *kataibates* came to Tarentum from Elis or Olympia, but for no good reason.

71. *ἐκάστη τῶν οἰκῶν οὓς οὐχ ὑπέδεξαντο τῶν εἰς Ἰαπυρίαν ἐκπεμφθέντων τοσαύτας ἔχει στήλας πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν κτλ. οὓς οὐκ ὑπέδεξαντο* Marcianus: *ὄσους* Musurus *ὑπέδεξαντο* Marcianus: *ὑπέδεξαντο* Schweighäuser Meineke. Kaibel adopts the emendations of both Musurus and Schweighäuser, Wehrli only that of Schweighäuser. Nilsson (1908, 315) prefers *ὄσους* ?νκ, retaining the negative despite Musurus on the ground that a lightning victim will *not* be restored to the bereaved household but will be buried at the site; Clearchus, he says, took the *stelai* as virtual cenotaphs. This is probably too strict; in any case, Clearchus remarks on the difference between the offerings to Zeus *kataibates* and normal offerings for the dead. Wehrli in his commentary makes a distinction between “the cult of Zeus *kataibates*” and “the *stelai* in front of the Tarentine houses,” which is plainly wrong, and is inclined to equate the *stelai* with intramural graves (mentioned by Polybius and now reported from the eastern quarter of the city), which is also plainly wrong. His approach is discounted as it should be by Schwabl, *RE Suppl.* 15 (1978) 1202. For the rest, the uncertainties of the text are not material to our understanding of the story.

72. Iasion is struck with lightning as he couples with Demeter in a fresh-plowed field, i.e. in plain sight. Though such conduct may be real-life magic to induce the fertilizing rain, the story gives us only shameless lust. So too the story of Ixion. This impudent inveterate offender, betrayer and murderer of kin, deserves to die ten times over but is struck by lightning only when he goes to bed and embraces a dummy. In the course of time the story became less a moral tale than an elaborate novella with Zeus as a good-hearted, ever trustful host. Apart from stories, the bodily taboos of Hesiod, *Works* 724–59, are similar, and one is the same, without the sanction of lightning. “Do not let yourself be seen near the hearth, naked and smeared with semen.”

73. The language, which plainly derives from Clearchus, leaves it unclear whether everyone died in a single tremendous strike (as suits a moral lesson) or whether the attendance at each booth died in separate strikes (as suits both verisimilitude and the facts of ritual).

74. All three festivals, being of a standard kind, were once celebrated at the usual interval, year by year: Nilsson (1906, 151), Robertson (2003a, 260n49). The festival *Charila* is a scapegoat rite, as Plutarch’s very literal step-by-step *aition* plainly shows. Many centuries before, when it must have been familiar as a yearly observance, it gave rise to the story of Aesop’s misfortune at Delphi. *Herois* as a Dionysiac festival perhaps took a grander form each second year, the so-called *trietêris*, and lent itself to the *octaetêris* for that reason. Annual celebrations need not have ceased when the three festivals were first claimed for a putative eight-year cycle; to restrict them to this cycle is likely to be an economy of later times. Pausanias suggests the utmost economy for the *Daidala* of Plataea, “every sixtieth year” (9.3.5), but perhaps this is a fiction concealing unintended irregularity.

75. Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 31b = Str. 9.3.12, p. 422, Plut. *Quaest. Gr.* 12, 293b-;

De def. or. 15, 418a-c, *Ael. Var. Hist.* 3.1, *Steph. Byz.* s. *Δειπνιάς*, hyp. 3 to Pind. *Pyth.* Modern comment takes us in various directions: Nilsson (1906, 150–57), refuting also some earlier views, W. R. Halliday on *Plut. Quaest. Gr.* 12 (Oxford 1928), Defradas (1954, 97–101), Fontenrose (1959, 453–58, 460–61), Burkert (1972a, 144–47).

76. Schaefer (1939, 54–56) with some attention to archaeological evidence suggests how a booth might perpetuate features of a substantial dwelling of the Geometric period (apsidal end, pitched roof with straw, etc.). But this is not at all Plutarch's meaning.

77. The processioners of the *Septeria* happen to include a boy *amphithales*, who is therefore equated with another officiating boy known for “wanderings and servitude” at Tempe (*Plut. De def. or.* 15, 418b). This boy is *architheoros* among a group of boys of well-born families who go from Delphi to Tempe and back over a route coextensive with the membership of the Delphic Amphictyony (*Ael. Var. Hist.* 3.1). The *theoria* to Tempe is an authentic Apolline custom unconnected with the *Septeria*. In a rival aetiology it is the wounded Python, rather than Apollo, who flees from the booth and expires on the road nearby, where he is buried and mourned by his son, with the name *Aix* “Goat” (*Plut. Quaest. Gr.* 12, 293c). Perhaps Python's son is the boy *amphithales*, and perhaps this conclusion is a goat sacrifice to atone for such guilt as the processioners have incurred.

78. Apollo himself has no competence in the matter of homicide purification; this aetiology shows as much. Orestes' recourse to Delphi, a secondary element, has created a wrong impression. See Parker (1983, 139), after R. R. Dyer.

79. The variant form *Στεπτήρια* “Wreathing [rites]” is prompted by the Apolline aetiology.

80. The myth of Athena's birth belongs to the widespread festival *Maimakteria*: Robertson (2001, 53). This festival will be adduced below as the general counterpart of the Delphian *Septeria*.

81. Nilsson (1906, 154–56) compares the *Septēria* to certain festivals of these deities and adduces the *Septēria* apropos of each of them (e.g. the *Daidala* of Plataea on p. 54). He relies most on Pausanias' account of a rite at nearby Tithorea, nominally for Isis but presumably inherited from Artemis. Here “booths” are indeed constructed—but they are the usual booths for selling festival commodities and quite distinct from the “pyre” also reported!

82. So Nilsson (1923) (but this article was not republished in *Opuscula Selecta*).

83. So Usener (1905, 1, 8–13), Nilsson (1908b, 314; 1955, 71–72), Cook (1925, 21–23), Schwabl, *RE* 10A (1972) 322 and *RE Suppl.* 15 (1978) 1110–11, Burkert (1977, 201), Parker (1987, 10).

84. Etym. Gen., Etym. Sym., Etym. Magn., Phot. s. *ἐνγλύσια* = Aesch. *Argeioi* fr. 17 Radt / *Argeiai* fr. 263 Mette, two lines about Capaneus and his *ἄρθρων ἐνγλυσίων*.

In the much fuller evidence for the Roman rite of *fulgur conditum* a dedication to Jupiter is plainly secondary: Latte (1960, 81n2).

85. Besides commemorative cults, Nilsson (1908b, 315; 1955, 72–73) holds that other cults, especially those of the household, were “sozusagen Blitzableiter” (lightning conductors) serving to draw the actual lightning away from the place in question. This curious notion is hardly more than a play on words.

86. In *Pyanopson*, after the sacrifice to Zeus *kataibates*, a day of the month is specified, “on the 16th”—which is exceptional, the day being otherwise taken as known. It refers to Zeus *kataibates*, says Daux (1983, 153, 155, 157) and likewise Parker (1987, 144, 146). But according to the usual calendar format it will refer to what follows. And the following entry will be dated only because the preceding date is variable, right down to the end of the month. In *Pyanopson*, Zeus *kataibates* is honored only as the weather dictates.

87. It is a day on which no assembly meetings are reported: Mikalson (1975, 47).

88. So Simon (1980) and *LIMC* 7 (1994) Poseidon nos. 139, 236–42. Admittedly, some experts doubt or dismiss this interpretation.

89. He came to Athens after dislodging Cassander from Thermopylae and spent the winter of 304/3 B.c. on the Acropolis. Habicht (1970, 48–50, 140) corrects the dating of the incident to 304 B.c., and Elderkin (1934, 32–33) shows that it was alluded to in the Greek original of Plautus' *Curculio* 413–18.

90. As Trümper puts it (1997, 213), “several Delphic months are nowhere else attested.”

91. So Nilsson (1906, 284n5), G. Rougemont, *CIDelph* 1 p. 59. Moret (1993, 303n47) (while following Nilsson) rebukes Kerenyi (1976, 214–18) for equating *Daidaphorios* with February, but in truth Kerenyi too follows Nilsson: he is speaking rather of the usual season for Dionysus' festival. The term “torchbearer festival” used by Trümper (1997, 213) is accurate but enigmatic.

92. See Robertson (2003b, 222–26).

93. Trümper (1997, 8) (Athens), 24, 35 (Ionia at large), 55–57, 60 (Ceos), 67–68, 70 (Thasos), 97–99 (Ephesus), 107–9 (Phocaea), 118 (Samothece), 248, 252 (Mytilene, Cyme).

94. *μαϊμάσω* is attested only as a late variant of *μαϊμάω* (*LSJ* s.v.).

95. Matthiessen (1873, 152–53). Lightning episodes (485) are far commoner than storms with precipitation (217) or hail (27).

96. So Nilsson (1908b, 315), Cook (1925, 18).

97. Lambert (2000b, 366, 389) = *SEG* 52.48. Most likely, it is either at the Academy or on the Acropolis. Lambert proposes Πγν[?π] in the preceding line since Socrates came to the hero so called while walking from the Academy to the Lyceum (Pl. *Lysis* 208a). But this was beside the city wall, far from the starting point.

98. Lambert (2002b, 357, 389), after Dow, explains why such observances suit this part of the calendar.

99. Usener (1905). West (2007, 243–44) thinks of a lightning god named *Κεραυνός* or the like as a proto-Indo-European heritage—citing the same inscription of Mantinea, *IG* 5.2.288, with which Usener begins.

100. Still less should we suppose that the nameless powers are pre-Greek. Vian (1952, 238) speaks of “a pre-Hellenic cult of the lightning,” Jost (1985, 337, 527) of “a pre-Hellenic cult of the lightning and of atmospheric phenomena.”

101. Pausanias also says that the Arcadian version of the Gigantomachy was located here. The same natural features are no doubt responsible, for the Gigantomachy is typically assigned to some uncanny landscape.

102. It is likely enough that shrine and altar were signaled in some book about Corinth that Pausanias consulted. In the next breath, on a different matter, he refers to the *Korinthiaka* of Eumelus.

103. West (2002, 115–16), in reconstructing the *Titanomachia*, insists on this divergence, but so as to argue that the *Kyklopes* were authentically enemies of Zeus, a view he ascribes to Eastern influence.

104. As West (1997, 295) observes, Zeus is furnished by the *Kyklopes* with *bronte* and *keranos* (*Theog.* 141) or with *bronte*, *keranos*, and *sterope* (*Theog.* 504–5), just as Baal in the Ugaritic epic is furnished by Kothar with a pair of hammers. To represent the power of nature as manufactured weapon is the Eastern way, as personified appearance the Greek way.

105. So Mondini (1983), persuasively.

106. Asto *κύκλος* “wheel” see Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 1.296,423, Frisk, *GEW* (with *addenda*) and Chantraine, *DELG* s.v. As to *-ωψ*, *-ωπες* “-appearing” see Chantraine, *DELG* s. *ὀπωπα*. The one eye is debated in Homeric scholia and other commentators;

it is nearly always omitted in the accounts of *Kyklopes* as smiths or wall builders; and it is but doubtfully depicted in only one of the vase paintings of *Od.* 9: Mondt (1983, 19–21, 31–36).

107. Nilsson (1932b, 135III9; 1955, 416), Fowler (1993, 38).

Selinus, c. 450 B.C.

The Tablet

The date of the tablet, which depends on letter forms and especially on comparison with a cache of lead tablets at Camarina, was fixed by JJK as the mid-fifth century or slightly earlier, “460–450 B.C.,” and this is widely accepted.¹ Let us recall the argument of chapter 2. The tablet is meant to be displayed in a public place such as the agora or the acropolis and to be rotated twice a year by means of the bronze clamp and three extricable nails. And the pattern of wear along the top edge of each column that was upside down shows that the tablet was indeed so displayed for a considerable time. And the mere fact of its survival shows that this use was never superseded—that it fell to the ground in 409 B.C., its wooden post cast down or burnt, and was never seen again until lately.²

The Background

Selinus, like other cities of Sicily, was ruled intermittently by tyrants in the later sixth century. But their day was past, much earlier than in other cities, when a decree of Selinus conceding the return of certain exiles was inscribed at Olympia in “c. 500 B.C.” (*IvOlympia* 22).³ Somewhat later, Selinus lost territory at the east when its outpost Heraclea Minoa was seized by Agrigentum; we may suppose that a city legitimately governed was no match for the tyrant Theron, who ruled Agrigentum from c. 488 to 472.⁴ The first age of tyrants ended round 461, and we are told that cities throughout Sicily, including Selinus, briefly joined together to improve conditions, relocating mercenary soldiers and restoring exiles (Diod. 11.68.1, 5, 72.1–2, 76.4–6). In any case, Selinus was then the only considerable city with a record of several decades of lawful government.

What sort of government it was—which of the labels “oligarchy” and “democracy” might apply—we do not know. Inscriptions give no

help; the decree at Olympia survives only in small fragments.⁵ Thucydides, describing the outlook in 415 B.C., does not say whether Selinus was vulnerable to Athenian attack by reason of faction (cf. 6.8.2, 20-3-4, 47-48, 62.1).⁶ According to Timaeus, as reflected by Diodorus and Diogenes Laertius, democracy was the goal of all the newly liberated cities, and Empedocles of Agrigentum was a democratic hero.⁷ But Timaeus is not a critical or even a diligent historian, and he wrote almost three centuries later. Selinus, moreover, among all those cities, had no continuing tradition of its own, after being destroyed and then resettled by the Carthaginians.

Despite these uncertainties, we can form a general picture, increasingly focused by archaeology, of how people lived.⁸ The territory of Selinus was large, even for Sicily, 100 km. along the coast, up to 30 km. inland, making an area well upward of 1,000 sq. km.—and most of it was prime arable land.⁹ It might have supported a population approaching two hundred thousand or even more.¹⁰ Settlements scattered throughout the territory show Greeks dominating or displacing the natives; it is likely that the settlements were much more numerous than the few presently known.¹¹ Greeks undoubtedly worked the land. The wheat called Σελινούσιος is one of five varieties named by Theophrastus, “Libyan” and “Thracian” being the other local names; it is distinguished from the rest as requiring the richest soil (*Caus. Pl.* 3.21.2, Pliny, HN 18.64).¹² It was also good terrain for horse breeding, a favorite pastime of wealthy Greeks and well attested at Selinus.¹³

The city that was first planted on the acropolis spread to the plateau at the north, then to all the sloping ground on either side; it was crowded. Both potters and smiths with their kilns were at work close by the houses.¹⁴ The city population has been estimated, perhaps too stringently, at 6,000-10,000.¹⁵ It was in any case a small proportion of the total. Many lived on or close to the farms. There is no reason to think that their status was inferior.

The immense wealth of Selinus came from selling the produce of the land, especially wheat. Selinus was paid in silver that became almost the earliest coinage in Sicily and for a time the most abundant after that of Himera.¹⁶ At Selinus, as at Himera, Carthage with its silver mines was probably the best customer. Selinus alone joined Carthage in attacking the rest of Greek Sicily in 480 B.C.; it must have seemed the only prudent course. But so far as we know, there was no accounting afterwards at the hands of the Greek victors; Selinus must have been prudent again.

Such is the background against which the tablet is to be viewed. We know so little of events that it cannot possibly be aligned with any political or social transition. But perhaps it should not anyway;

perhaps society was stable, and the community was at peace. The tablet itself points this way, since it was displayed for a long time. It was altered in three places, but not so long after it was first inscribed, in the same style of lettering, and the changes are not important. If it was prompted by some momentary need, it came to serve a regular one. More likely, it was always meant to reinforce the accustomed way of life.

1. JJK (ix, 48, 123). There have been two marked objections, but of opposite tendency. Graham (1995, 367) prefers to say no more than “probably first half of the fifth century.” Cordano (1996, 137; 1997, 424) thinks that “the second quarter of the fifth century” is “a little too high.”

2. The tablet would be a familiar object if displayed as long as this. In chapter 9, note 33, it was suggested that the literary anecdote about the people of Selinus praying to Empedocles “just as to a god” echoes the similar emphatic phrase in the middle of column A.

3. So Asheri 1979 = SEG 29.403, cf. De Angelis (2003, 160–61).

4. *FGrH* 532 F 1 C 30, the *Register* of Athena’s temple at Lindus, records the dedication of spoils from Heraclea Minoa by “the Agrigentines” among a series of entries that stray wildly from chronological order. Some hold that Theron is in fact excluded because he is not named in his own person: Dunbabin (1948, 353–54), De Angelis (2003, 161–62) (but elsewhere De Angelis [2003, 179] inadvertently assumes that it is Theron). Now Theron increased the power of Agrigentum dramatically; he even interfered at Himera. And it was at Heraclea Minoa that he discovered the bones of Minos (Diod. 4.79.4)—to what purpose, if not to signal new ownership?

5. The closely contemporary tablets of Camarina are individual records of some 150 citizens, each giving name and father’s name and numbered phratry, noting also if someone is deceased; they have been generally thought to indicate some democratic purpose. But Robinson (2002, 69–75) throws doubt on all the purposes proposed so far.

6. Afterwards, as another instance of the widespread convulsion that was fully comparable with Herodotus’ Persian Wars, Thucydides observes that Megarian exiles fighting with Athens were pitted against their kinsmen from Selinus (7.57.8). The Megarian exiles were democrats, and Selinus sent a body of horsemen who must have been well-to-do, but it was not to Thucydides’ purpose to say whether this mattered.

7. On Timaeus’ slanted account of Empedocles see de Waele (1971, 1.169–72).

8. De Angelis (2003, 129–45, 173–99) assembles evidence for the city and the territory respectively.

9. 1,500 sq. km., “between 70 and 95% arable land”: De Angelis (2003, 182). Or 1,165 sq. km.: Asheri, *CAH*² 4 (1988) 765.

10. “Even on the most conservative estimate, between, say, 161,000 and 215,000 people”: De Angelis (2003, 182).

11. De Angelis (2003, 175–78).

12. De Angelis (2003, 180–83, 186–87).

13. De Angelis (2003, 187).

14. Fischer-Hansen (2000, 106–7, 113–14), cf. De Angelis (2003, 184).

15. So De Angelis (2003, 149). His estimate has an air of paradox since he sets himself against all the higher estimates of the past, some based on military numbers, others on the cemeteries round the city—but in such cases the whole territory was in

view.

16. Arnold-Biucchi (1992).

PART II

At Cyrene, Rules for Every Need

The Inscription

Text

Cyrene's rules of purification—this term must serve, though it is not quite apt—are inscribed on the same tall block of white marble as the long list of cities to which grain was exported during the famine years c. 330-325 B.C. The two inscriptions occupy three faces of the block, with the list at the right, column A of the rules in the middle, and column B at the left. The block is nearly complete, but broken in two near the top and broken away at the bottom. In column A two lines are almost wholly lost at the break, and in column B four and a half lines are badly damaged. As for the bottom, column A lacks perhaps the last two lines, and column B breaks off higher up, with more extensive damage to this face—yet the last surviving line may be nearly the last that was inscribed. There is also much wear at the edges and in a few other places; many lines have letters missing at the beginning or the end or both. The block served as a seat in the *frigidarium* of the Small Baths of the Roman period—after being plastered, which is fortunate.

Though the inscription was published twice from the stone and more recently from squeezes made long ago, and though it is reproduced in some standard collections, no existing text is satisfactory. The photographs that accompany Oliverio's edition are the only reliable source. The following text is based on scrutiny of the photographs at each point of difficulty.

Column A

[Α]πόλλων ἐχρη[σε].
[ἐς ἀ]εὶ καθαρμοῖς καὶ ἀγνήαις κα[ὶ ἱκ]-
[ετ]ήναις χρεϊμένος τὰν Λεβύαν οἰς[έν].

- 5 [αἰ] κα ἐπὶ τὰν γᾶν ἢ ἐπὶ τὰμ πόλιν ἐπείηι νόσο[s ἢ λι]-
[μὸ]ς ἢ θάνατος, θύεν ἔμπροσθε τᾶμ πυλᾶν, [ἀντ]-
[ί]ο[s τῶ ἀποτροπαίῳ, τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι τῶι ἀποτρ[όπ]-
[ω] χίμαρον ἐρυθρόν.

- 10 [κ]ᾶλον ἐν ἱερῶι πεφυκός· αἶ κα τῶι θεῶι τὰν τιμὰν
[ἐ]ρείσες, τῶι κάλῳ χρηστῇ καὶ ἐς ἱερὰ καὶ ἐς βάβ[α]-
[λα] καὶ ἐς μιάρᾱ.

- 15 [ἀ]πό γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ τὰν νύκτα κοιμαθὲς θυσεῖ ὁ[κ]-
[α κα] δῆλῃται· τὰν δὲ ἀμέρην κοιμηθεὲς λωνάμεν[ος]
[κατακέφαλα ἐ]ῖτι ὅποι κα δῆλ[ηται] πλὴν ἢ ἐς [τὸν]
[μὲν].....]ταν· τὰν δὲ[...]
[.....]
[.....]
[ἀ]λ' ἐχέω ὄροφον μιανεῖ· τὸμ μ[ὲν] ὑπώροφον μιανεῖ τὸν
[δ' ἐ]ξώροφον οὐ μιανεῖ, αἶ κα μὴ ὑπένθην· ὁ δ' ἄ[νθρ]-
[ω]πος ὁ κα ἔνδοι ἦι, α<ὕ>τὸς μὲν μιάρὸς τέντα[ι ἀμ]-
[έρα]ς τρίς· ἄλλον δὲ οὐ μιανεῖ οὐδὲ ὄπνι κα ἐνθ[η] ο]-
20 [ύ]τος ὁ ἄνθρωπος.

- Ἀκαμαντίων ὁσαῖα παντὶ καὶ ἀγνώι καὶ βαβάλω[ι],
πλὴν ἀπ' ἀνθρώπῳ Βάττω τῷ {τω} ἀρχαγέτα· καὶ
Τριτοπατέρων καὶ ἀπὸ Ὀνυμᾶστῳ τῷ Δελφῶι{ι}.
ἀπ' ἄλλῳ ὅπῃ ἄνθρωπος ἔκαμε, αὐκ ὁσαῖα ἀγνώ<ι>·
25 τῶν δὲ ἱερῶν ὁσαῖα παντί.

- αἶ κα ἐπὶ βωμῶι θύσῃ ἱερήιον ὁ τι μὴ νόμος θύειν, τ[ὸ]
ποτιπιάμμα ἀφελὲν ἀπὸ τῷ βωμῷ καὶ ἀποπλύν-
αι, καὶ τὸ ἄλλο λῦμα ἀνελὲν ἐκ τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ τὰν ἱκ-
νιν ἀπὸ τῷ βωμῷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ ἀφελὲν ἐς καθάρον·
30 καὶ τόκα δὴ ἀπονηιάμενος, καθάρας τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ
ζαμίαν θύσας βοτὸν τέλειν, τόκα δὴ θυέτω ὡς νόμ[ος].

ἀκόχμιος μέστα ἐς ἀδελφείων τέκνα.

- αἶ κα δέκυτος ἦι ἄνθρωπος ἡβητής, καθάρμας α-
[ύ]τὸς αὐτὸν αἵματι, καθαρεῖ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ πωλη-
35 [θές] ἐν τῷ ἀγορῷ ὁπόσῳ κα πλείστῳ ἄξις ἦ[ι],
προθυσεῖ πρὸ τᾶς δεκύτης ζαμίαν βοτὸν τέλ-

[εν]· οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς δεκάτης· καὶ τόκα δὲ θυεῖ τὰν
[δ]εκάταν· καὶ ἀποιεῖ ἐς καθαρὸν· αἱ δὲ μῆ, τῶν α[ὖ]-
[τ]ῶν δησῆται· σφοδρῶς δὲ οἶσεῖ πᾶς ὁ θυῶν.

- 40 [ἐ]πηβος, αἱ μὲν τί κα ἐκὼν μῆ, ἀποχρεῖ καθάρα[θ]-
[α]ι αὐτὸν καὶ ζαμίας οὐ δεῖ· αἱ δὲ κα ἐκὼν μῆ, κ[α]-
[θα]ρεῖ το ἱερὸν· καὶ ζαμίαν προθυσεῖ βοτὸν τέλει[ν].

- [α]ἱ κα χρήματα δέκατα ἦι, ἐκτιμάσας τὰ χρήματ-
[α], καθαρεῖ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τῇ χρήματα δίχα· καὶ τόκα
45 [δ]ὴ προθυσεῖ ζαμίαν βοτὸν τέλει· οὐ τῶς δεκάτ-
[α]ς· καὶ τόκα δὴ θυεῖ τὰν δεκάταν· καὶ ἀποιεῖ ἐς
[κα]θαρὸν· αἱ δὲ μῆ, τῶν αὐτῶν δησεῖ· τῶν δὲ χρημά-
[τα]ν, ἃς κα δέκατα ἦι, ἐντόφριον οὐκ ἐνθήσει οὐδ[έ]-
[πω] οὐδὲ ἐν οὐδὲ χύτλι πρί[ν] καὶ τῶι θεῶι ἀπο[δε]-
50 [κα]τε[ύ]νει· αἱ δὲ κα χύτλι ἐνίκει ἢ ἐντόφριον ἐνθήῃ, κα-
[θα]ρμὸς τὸ Ἀπολλώνιον, ζαμίαν προθυσεῖ κατὰ τὰν
[ἀ]μα[ρ]τίαν βοτὸν τέλει.

- [αἱ κ]α δέκατος ἐὼν ἀνθρώπος ἀποθάνῃ, κατακομί-
[ζα]ντες τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ταῖ μὲν πρατίσται ἀμέραι
55 [ἐπ]ι[θ]ησεῖ ὅ τι κα δῆληται ἐπὶ τὸ σῆμα, δεῦτερον δ-
[έ] οὐδὲ ἔν πρίν κα ἀποδεκατεῦσει τῶι θεῶν· καὶ ο[ὖ]-
[δὲ] θυ[σεῖ] οὐδ' ἐπὶ τὸ σῆμα εἴτε· ἐκτιμασέντι δὲ ὁπ[ό]σο-
[ν] πλ[η]εῖστον ἄξιως ἦι, κοινὸς ἐὼν τῶι θεῶν· καθάρα[s]
[δὲ] τὸ Ἀπολλώνιον καὶ τὰ χρήματα δίχα, προθύ[σα]-
60 [ς] αὐτό[ς] ζαμίαν βοτὸν τέλει· οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς δεκά-
[τας] προ[β]ώμιον, θυσεῖ τὰν δεκάταν προβώμιον· [κα]-
[ι] ἀπο[β]οῖε ἐς καθαρὸν· αἱ δὲ μῆ, τῶν αὐτῶν δησεῖ.

- [αἱ κ]α ἀποθάνῃ δέκατος ἐὼν καὶ τὰ τέκνα καταλ[ί]π-
[η]ι ὧν κα τ[ὰ] μὲν ζῶν, τὰ δὲ ἀποθάνῃ, ἐκτιμάσας τὰ [ἀ]-
65 [πα]λλαγ[μ]ένα ὁπόσῳ κα πλείστον ἄξια ἦι, καθάρα[s] τ[ὴ]-
[ν] Ἀπολλώ[ν]ιον καὶ τὰ χρήματα δίχα, προθυσεῖ ζαμί[α]-
[ν] τὰν τῶ ἡ[β]ατῶ προβώμιον· καὶ τόκα δὴ θυσεῖ τὰν δε-
[κά]ταν προβώμιον· τὰν δὲ ζῶν καθάρας αὐτὸς αὐτ[ὸ]-
[ν] αἵματι καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν δίχα, πωληθὲς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς β-
70 [υ]σεῖ τὰν τῶ ἡβατῶ ζαμίαν βοτὸν τέλει· καὶ τόκα δ[ὲ]-
[τὴ]ν θυσεῖ τὰν δεκάταν· καὶ ἀποιεῖ ἐς καθαρὸν· αἱ [δὲ]
[μῆ, τῶν αὐτῶν δησεῖ.

- [ἡβατῶς ἐὼν], ἐπεὶ κα ἄρξεται θύειν κατὰ νόμον, [ἐπεὶ]
[κα ἐκτιμα]σθῇ, τὸ λοιπὸν θυσεῖ ὁπόσα κα δῆλη[ι]ται ὥς]
75 [δέ κα καθά]ρῃ, καθαρμὸς ἀποχρεῖ ὁπ[ό]σοις τις [τὸ ἱερὸν]-
[ν κατέ]νθη,· καθαροὶ οὐ δεῖ· αἱ δὲ κα δῆλη[ι]ται, θύσας βό-
[ταν τέλει]ν προβώμιον, οἶσεῖ ὅπ[ου] κα δῆληται.]

[.....] βω [.....] χα [.....]
 [.....] ενε [.....]
 80 [.....]
 [.....]
 [.....]

Column B

[.....]
 [νύμφ]αμ μ[έν] ἴσσαν τὸ κοιτατή[ριον] ζ[ώναν]
 [δεῦ] ἐς Ἀρτ[αμιν] λῦσαι· ἅψα δὲ οὐχ ὑπώ[ροφ]-
 85 [ος] τῷ ἀνδρὶ τένται οὐδὲ μίασει, μέστα κα
 [ἐς] Ἀρταμιν ἐνθῆ· ἃ δέ κα ταῦτα μὴ ποιήσω[ι]-
 [σα] μιᾷ ἑκάσσα, καθάραισα τὸ Ἀρταμίτιον ἐπ[ι]-
 [θ]υσεῖ ζαμίαν βοτὸν τέλει· καὶ τόκα δὴ εἴτ-
 [ι] τὸ κοιτατήριον· αἱ δέ κα μὴ ἐκοῖσα μιᾷ, κα-
 90 [θ]αρεῖ τὸ ἱερόν.
 [.....]
 [νύ]μφαν δὲ τὸ νυμφῆιον ἐς Ἀρταμιν κατ[εν]-
 [θ]έν δεῖ, ὅποκα κα δήληται Ἀρταμιτίαις, [ὥς]
 [τ]άχιστι δὲ λῶων· ἃ δέ κα μὴ κατένθῃ, [ὑποθ]-
 [υ]σεῖ τῇ Ἀρτάμιτι ἃ κ[α] δήλητ[αι] τοῖς Ἀρταμιτί-
 95 [αι]ς· μὴ κατεληλευ[θῆναι] δὲ καθαρεῖ τὸ ἱερ[ι]-
 [όν] καὶ ἐπιθυσεῖ ζ[αμίαν] βοτὸν τέλει.

[.....]
 [νύμφα] κόμωα πρὶν τεκέν[ει] τὸ νυμφῆ[ον]
 ἐς Ἀρταμιν· [αὐτὰ δὲ τ]ῇ ἄρκωι δωσει πόδας καὶ
 τὰν κεφαλάν καὶ τὸ δέρμα· αἱ δέ κα μὴ κατ[έν]-
 100 [θῃ] πρὶν τεκέν, κύτειτι σὺμ βοτῶι τελεί· ἃ δ[ε]
 κατίασσα ἀγνευσεῖ ἐβδέμαν καὶ ὀγδόαν
 καὶ ἡνάταν, καὶ ἃ μὴ κατεληλευθῆναι ἄγν-
 ευσεῖ ταύτας τὰς ἀμέρας· αἱ δέ κα μιᾷ, καθα-
 ραμένα αὐτὰ καθαρεῖ τὸ ἱερόν καὶ ἐπιθυσ[εῖ]
 105 ζαμίαν βοτὸν τέλει.

αἷ κα γυνὰ ἐγβάλῃ, αἱ μέγ κα διάδῃλον ἦε, μ[ι]-
 αίνονται ὥσπερ ἀπὸ θανόντος· αἱ δέ κα μὴ
 διάδῃλον ἦε, μαίνεται αὐτὰ ἃ οἰκία καθάπε[ρ]
 ἀπὸ λεχός.

110 ἱεσίων.
 ἱέσιος, ἐπακτός· αἱ κα ἐπιπεμφθῇ ἐπὶ τὰν
 οἰκίαν, αἱ μέγ κα ἰσαῖ ἀφ' ὀπινός οἱ ἐπῆνθε, ὁ-
 νυμαεῖ αὐτὸν προειπὼν τρεῖς ἀμέρας· αἱ δ[ε]
 κα τεθνάκη ἐγγαιος ἢ ἄλλῃ πῃ ἀπολώλῃ[ι],
 115 αἱ μέγ κα ἰσαῖ τὸ ὄνυμα, ὄνυμασθὶ προερεῖ· αἱ

δέ κα μὴ ἰσαῖ, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, αἶτε ἀνὴρ αἶτε γυνὰ
 ἐσσί. κολοσὸς ποιήσαντα ἔρσενα καὶ θήλεια[ν]
 ἢ καλίνος ἢ γαῖνος, ὑποδεξάμενον παρτιθ[έ]-
 120 μεν τὸ μέρος πάντων. ἐπεὶ δέ κα ποιῆσες τὰ
 νομιζόμενα, φέροντα ἐς ὕλαν ἀεργὸν ἔρε-
 [ῖ]σαι τὰς κολοσὸς καὶ τὰ μέρη.

ἰκέσιος ἄτερος, τετελεσμένος ἢ ἀτελής. ἰσ-
 σάμενος ἐπὶ τῷ δαμοσίῳ ἱαρῷ, αἶ μέγ κα προ[φέ]-
 ρηται, ὁπόσσω κα προφέρηται, οὕτως τελίσκ[ε]-
 125 σθαι. αἶ δέ κα μὴ προφέρηται, γὰρ καρπὸν θ[ύ]-
 εν καὶ σπονδὰν καθ' ἔτος αἶει. αἶ δέ κα παρῇ, ἐ[γ]
 νέω δις τόσσα. αἶ δέ κα διαλίπη τέκνον ἐγ[λα]-
 θόμενον καὶ οἱ προφέρηται, ὅ τι κά οἱ μαντε[υ]-
 ομένῳ ἀναιρεθῇ, τοῦτο ἀποτεισεῖ τῷ θεῷ · κ[αῖ]
 130 θυσεῖ, αἶ μέγ κα ἰσαῖ, ἐπὶ τὸμ πατρῷον· αἶ δέ μή, [χρή]-
 σασθαι.

ἰκέσιος τρίτος, αὐτοφόνος. ἀφικετεύεν ἐς [ἱαρο]-
 πολίαν καὶ τριφυλίαν. ὥς δέ κα καταγγήλ[ε]ι [δέκε]-
 σθαι, ἴσαντα ἐπὶ τῷ ὠδῷ ἐπὶ νάκει λευκ[ῶ]ι κλύ]-
 135 ζεν καὶ χρίσαι· καὶ ἐξίμεν ἐς τὰν δαμοσί[αν]
 ὁδὸν καὶ σιγῆν πάντας ἢ κα ἔξοι ἔωντ[ι τὸ]-
 [ς] ὑποδεκομένος τὸν προαγγελτῆ[ρα· ἐς ἱα]-
 [ρὸ]ν παρίμεν τὸν ἀφικετευ[ό]μενο[ν ἐπὶ τῶν]
 [θυς]ῶν· καὶ τὸς ἐπομένος [ἐπεσενθέν. ὥς δέ]
 140 [κα θ]ύσει θύη καὶ ἄλλα [τὰ νομιζόμενα]
 [.] ἐμη [.]

Translation

Careful translations of the past include Oliverio (1933, 24-28), Buck, *The Greek Dialects* no. 115, Parker (1983, 333-50), Dobias-Lalou (2000, 304-7), and Rhodes and Osborne, *GHI* no. 97.

Column A

1–3. Apollo ordained: dwell in Libya forever using purifications and abstinences and [supplications].

4–7. If sickness [or famine] or death come against the land or against the city, sacrifice in front of the city gates, [facing] the Averter, to Apollo the averter a red he-goat.

8–10. Wood growing on sacred land. If you put up the price for the god, you can use the wood equally for sacred and for ordinary and for tainted use.

11–15. A man coming from a woman with whom he has lain at night shall sacrifice whenever he wishes. If he has lain with her by day, after washing himself [thoroughly], he shall go wherever he wishes except into [the temple. -].

16–20. A woman in childbed shall pollute the house. She shall pollute anyone inside. She shall not pollute anyone outside if he does not go in. Any person who is inside shall himself be polluted for three days. This person shall not pollute anyone else no matter where he goes in.

21–25. Of the rites of *Akamantes*, the use belongs to everyone both pure and profane, except (of those rites descending) from the man Battus, the founder. And of *Tritopateres* (the use so belongs except) also (of those rites descending) from Onymastus the Delphian. (Of those rites descending) from an ancestor who is different, the use does not belong to the pure. But of the shrines, the use belongs to everyone.

26–31. If one sacrifices on the altar a victim that it is not the custom to sacrifice, take away the thickened residue from the altar and wash it off, and remove the other soilure from the shrine and the ash from the altar, and take away the fire to a pure place. And then after washing oneself, after purifying the shrine and sacrificing as a penalty an animal full grown, then one shall sacrifice as the custom is.

32. (One) bound as far as brothers' children.

33–39 . If a grown man is tithed, having purified himself with blood, he shall purify the shrine. And after being sold in the agora for the most he is worth, he shall sacrifice beforehand, before the tithe, as a penalty, an animal full grown, not from the tithe. And then he shall sacrifice the tithe. And he shall carry away to a pure place. If he does not, the same measures will still be needed. Everyone who sacrifices shall bring a basket.

40–42. A lad not yet of age, if he pollutes himself involuntarily, it is enough for him to purify himself and a penalty is not needed. If he pollutes himself voluntarily, he shall purify the shrine. And as a penalty he shall sacrifice beforehand an animal full grown.

43–52. If it is property that is tithed, after assessing the property, he shall purify the shrine and the property separately. And then he shall sacrifice beforehand, as a penalty, an animal full grown not from the tithe. And then he shall sacrifice the tithe. And he shall carry away to a pure place. If he does not, the same measures will still be needed. From the property, as long as it is tithed, he shall not make any funerary offering whatever nor a libation until he pays the tithe to the god. If he brings libation or makes funerary offerings, after purifying Apollo's shrine he shall sacrifice beforehand as a penalty, according to the nature of the offense, an animal full grown.

53–62. If a man dies that is tithed, after they bury the man, on the first day he shall place whatever he wishes on the tomb, but after that nothing until he pays the tithe to the god. And he shall neither sacrifice nor go to the tomb. They shall assess him for the most he is worth since he is partner with the god. After purifying Apollo's shrine and the property separately, after himself sacrificing beforehand as a penalty an animal full grown not from the tithe in front of the altar, he shall sacrifice the tithe in front of the altar. And he shall carry away to a pure place. If he does not, the same measures will still be needed.

63–72. If one that is tithed dies and has left children, of whom some are living and some deceased, after assessing the deceased for the most they are worth, after purifying Apollo's shrine and the property separately, he shall sacrifice beforehand the penalty of a grown man in front of the altar. And then he shall sacrifice the tithe in front of the altar. As for the living child, after purifying himself with blood and the shrine separately, after being sold in the agora, he shall sacrifice as the penalty of a grown man an animal full grown. And then he shall sacrifice the tithe in front of the altar. And he shall carry away to a pure place. If he does not, the same measures will still be needed.

73–82. [Being a grown man,] when he begins to sacrifice according to custom, [after he is assessed], for the future he shall sacrifice whenever he wishes. [After he has purified,] the purification suffices. Whenever one [comes down to the sanctuary,] it is not necessary to purify. If he wishes, [after sacrificing an animal full grown] in front of the altar, he shall carry away [wherever he wishes]. *The next five lines are almost or entirely illegible.*

Column B

83–90. A bride on the one hand must go to the bedchamber to Artemis and undo her belt. She shall not be under the same roof with the

husband, nor shall she pollute herself, until she comes to Artemis. If, without doing this, she pollutes herself voluntarily, after purifying the shrine of Artemis, she shall further sacrifice, as a penalty, an animal full grown. And then she shall go to the bedchamber. If she pollutes herself involuntarily, she shall purify the shrine.

91–96. A bride on the other hand must come down to the bride-place to Artemis, whenever she wishes at a festival of Artemis, but the sooner the better. If she does not come down, she shall discharge the sacrifice to Artemis anyway, of whatever victim she wishes at that festival of Artemis. Because she did not come down, she shall purify the shrine of Artemis and further sacrifice, as a penalty, an animal full grown.

97–105. A bride, when pregnant, before giving birth shall go down to the bride-place to Artemis. She herself shall give to the Bear feet and the head and the skin. If she does not come down before giving birth, she shall go down with an animal full grown. She who goes down shall keep pure on the seventh and the eighth and the ninth, and she who does not come down shall keep pure on these days. If she pollutes herself, after purifying herself she shall purify the shrine and shall further sacrifice, as a penalty, an animal full grown.

106–109. If a woman miscarries, if it is recognizable, they are polluted as if by a corpse. If it is not recognizable, the house itself is polluted as if by childbirth.

110. Of suppliant (purifications).

111–121. Suppliant (purification), conjured by magic. If something be sent against the house, if he knows from whom it came against him, he shall name him while giving notice for three days. If he is dead beneath the earth or is done for in some other way, if he knows the name, he shall give notice by name, but if he does not know it, the words are “O creature, whether you be man or woman.” After making figurines male and female of either wood or clay, after receiving them for entertainment, set out the share of everything. When you have done the customary things, bring the figurines and the shares to an uncultivated wood and set them up properly.

122–131. Suppliant (purification) the second, paid or not paid. After sitting down at the public shrine, if it is ordained by the oracle, however much is ordained, pay accordingly. But if nothing is ordained, offer fruit of the earth and libation every year in perpetuity. But if he omits it, twice as much again. If a child neglects it in ignorance and it is ordained for him, whatever he is bidden on inquiring of the oracle, this he shall pay to the god and shall sacrifice, if he knows where it is, at the ancestral tomb. If not, ask the oracle.

132–141. Suppliant (purification) the third, slaying with one's own hand. Intercede at the office of [chief priest] and the body of three tribes. When he has announced that he [receives], after seating him on the threshold on a white fleece, wash and anoint him. And all go out to the public street and keep silent while they are outside, those who respond to the annunciator. Go on [into the sanctuary], the one who is object of the intercession, [for the sacrifices.] And those following [come in after him. When] he has offered cakes and other [usual things]... *The next line is almost wholly illegible, and whether the inscription continued further does not appear.*

Notes on the Text

The inscription was first published by Ferri (1927), and remarks on the text were offered by, among others, Wilamowitz (1927), De Sanctis (1927), Herzog (1928), Latte (1928), and Vogliano (1928) (together with P. Maas). It was published again by Oliverio (1933) with a full description and a commentary sometimes fanciful and, above all, with four splendid photographs, pls. I-IV, each upward of 24 x 33 cm., i.e. well over half the actual size of the block (height 1.33 m., breadth and depth c. 40 m.). Dobias-Lalou (2000) has now produced “a critical edition” that draws on repeated inspection of the stone and more particularly on her study, in September 1971, of squeezes made by F. Chamoux in 1947. She warns us that the stone itself in its present state will not repay further study without special equipment and ideal conditions. Unfortunately, she says very little about the basis of her readings, either in brief critical notes (mostly an impartial report of past readings and supplements) or in a brief, selective commentary or again in remarks on various words that are scattered throughout her book. Her text seems to show that the squeezes did not offer more, and often offered less, than Oliverio's photographs, not to speak of the deteriorated stone.

In the following notes I discuss the reading of doubtful letters and the space occupied by lost letters wherever it matters. The size of the letters can vary somewhat from line to line throughout the inscription; this must be borne in mind in calculating the loss in a given line from the letters just above or below. In neither column are the lines preserved to the last letter over any long stretch, so we cannot see how regular the right margin was. But necessary restorations do suggest that the inscriber took care to insert the last possible letter. I do not use the sublinear dot when the traces, however incomplete, leave no doubt of a given letter.

1. [A]πόλλων ἔχρη[σε] The two words are inscribed in letters larger and more widely spaced so as to fill up the line.
- 2-3. [π]-/[ομπ]ήiais Ferri [μ]-/[αντ]ήiais Wilamowitz
 [ἰ]-/[κετ]ήiais Herzog [θε]-/[ραπ]ήiais Oliverio
 [δε]-/[κατ]ήiais Defradas. Lines 2-3 are inscribed in letters slightly larger than all the rest, just the size of the lettering in the famine inscription. If line 2 was of the same length as line 3, only one letter is missing. But if it extended as far as all the rest, two letters are missing. So the last of three coordinate terms may be completed in several ways. I have chosen ἀκετοιαιο “supplications” as the general term best matching the first two, “purifications” and “abstinences,” and also as looking forward to the supplication expressly prescribed by the very last rule, lines 132-41. But other terms might equally look forward to some particular rule. πομπήiais “processions” might look to the sacrifice at the city gates mentioned next, μαντήiais “oracles” to the repeated consultations of a local oracle in lines 122-31, δεκατήiais “tithings” to the professed “tithing” rules of lines 32-82. This last term, adopted now by Dobias-Lalou, might seem an attractive supplement because the tithing section is the longest and most carefully composed, being divided into five subsections of ten lines each so as to echo the tithing; indeed, it has probably determined the overall arrangement, as we shall see in chapter 20. Nonetheless, “tithings” are more of a threat than a recourse, and so perhaps less suited to these words of reassurance.
- 4-5. λοι]-/[μδ]ς Ferri πῦρ “fever” Wilamowitz αῦ]-/[ονά]
 Latte δλ]-/[οά] Herzog λι]-/[μδ]ς Oliverio. Again the supplement remains in doubt. Space perhaps favors λι]-/[μδ]ς rather than λοι]-/[μδ]ς, but any trace of ς is very slight. Wilamowitz envisaged also “an adjective for νοσος in the sense of λοιμοδην.” Latte proposed “drought” on the grounds that (1) “plague” and “fever” are much like “sickness,” and (2) a red animal is sacrificed at Rome to save the grain from heat and drought. But (1) adverse conditions may variously cause famine or plague as well as individual sickness and death, and (2) the Roman instance belongs to a calendar concerned with seasonal hazards.
- 5-6. φ[άρμα]-/[κο]ν vel ο[ιχθει]-/[σᾶ]ν Ferri
 θ[υσ]-/[ίαν] Wilamowitz [καθαρ]-/[μδ]ν De Sanctis
 [ἐναντ]-/[ίον] Vogliano [ῥπι]-/[σθε] Herzog [καθα]-/[ρμ]α

Oliverio [καθα₂ρ₁μ₁ω₁ĩ α₁μ]α vel μετ]α τ₂ω(ι) ἀποτροπαίω(ι)

Sokolowski $[\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau]-/[\acute{\iota}\omicron]\S$ R. All the supplements hitherto proposed are very dubious, with respect to space or syntax or both. In line 5, after $\pi\nu\lambda\tilde{\alpha}\nu$, only three letters are wanted. Is there a trace of the first of these? Ferri saw a rounded shape, i.e. Φ or O or Θ , which is not borne out by the photograph (there is indeed such an evanescent shape, O , at the end of line 4). Is there a letter trace at the beginning of line 6? Here a descending stroke seems unmistakable; hence Oliverio's A. A vertical stroke above it is slighter and not properly positioned for N . And the angle of the descending stroke points to Σ rather than A. Whence $[\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau]-/[\acute{\iota}\omicron]\S$.

In line 6 *τῷ ἀποτροπαίῳ* has often been taken as a neuter substantive, meaning either “the evil to be averted” or “the averter shrine / monument / altar.” Latte (1928, 41) observes, as if it were a fact, “before the gates of Cyrene there stood an ἀποτροπαῖον.” Is it then a standard term or a standard object? It is not. An averter thing is otherwise unheard of; there are only averter *rites*. A dog is offered to Hecate as an instance of *ἀποτροπαίων καὶ ἀποτροπαίους* (Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 111, 290d). A priestess at Soli, called *hypekkaustria* after certain burnt offerings, ποιεῖσθαι τινασ θύσας καὶ ῥονργίαν ἀποτροπαίονο (Plut. *Quaest. Gr.* 3, 292a). Vengeful deities are placated *ἀποτροπαίοις τισὶ καὶ ἑξακεστηρίοις θυσίαις* (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 5.54.3).

It is surely a masculine, “the Averter,” i.e. a statue of Apollo so called. Now Apollo *apotropaïos* was undoubtedly a familiar figure at Cyrene; he only lends himself once more to this occasion. He reappears, and with the same animal victim (but not a red one), at the head of a later *lex sacra* listing a number of civic deities (chapter 18, pp. 281–83). He is a vivid presence whose statue the worshippers will be “facing” (predicate adjective) as they sacrifice.

6-7. Space does not suffice for ἀποτρ[οπαί]-/ωι, and ἀποτρ[όπ]-/ωι is unexceptionable as a variant adopted just because the other form regularly serves to denote the statue. According to Dobias-Lalou, the shorter form is “a hypocoristic.”

9. Dobias-Lalou somewhat doubts the reading [ἐ]ρείσες, but it gives just the right sense: “put up” the price that is asked.

11-12. $\check{\sigma}[\kappa]-/[a\ \kappa a]$ Maas $\check{\sigma}[\tau i\ \kappa a]$ vel $\check{\sigma}[\pi v-]/[i]$ Ferri. The meaning “whenever,” i.e. “as soon as,” seems best. Either “whatever” or “wherever” would refer to any deity at any shrine, and such broad permission is unlikely. As in the previous rule and in the extensive tithing rules and probably in the last rule of all, the unnamed

sanctuary will be Apollo's.

12. The first three letters of *δήληται* depend on the merest traces.

13. *[κατακέφαλα κάτε]ιτι* Ferri *[θυσεῖ μετ' ὀλίγ]ον τι* Oliverio *κάτειτι ἐς ἰαρόν] τι* Sokolowski *[κατακέφαλα εἰ]τι*
R. Beneath this is the break across the stone; only the upper part of the letters survive. Before *τι* the same broken edge continues for the space of two or three letters, but the seeming traces cannot for the most part be interpreted as letter strokes; they are only cracks. Oliverio's reading is mistaken. (Dobias-Lalou [2000, 162] remarks that such a phrase is not wanted anyway before *ὅπου κα* and that the preposition to be restored is *πεδο*.) Instead, *ι* alone should be distinguished as the last preserved letter.

Ferri's restoration is too long by about three letters. And as Wilamowitz observes, a special destination would be required by the compound—Sokolowski should not have made it indefinite. The simple verb *εἴτι* will do nicely, together with the adverb Ferri supplies. To wash “thoroughly” is required elsewhere: *λουσαμονονο* . . . *κατακοψαλα* (IG 2.5.593 = LSCG 97 line 30, Ceos, s. V *ante*, funerary regulations), *λουσαμονονο* . . . *κατακοψαλα, λουσαμονην κατακοψαλα* (IG 2 LSCG 55 lines 4, 5–6, Athens, s. I *post*, cult of Men), cf. *λουσομενοι κατακοψαλα* (IG 2 24–25).

13–14.

ἐς τ[ὸ] / [Ἀρταμίτιον ἢ ἐς Ἀρταμιν τὰν Ἐκά]τῳ

Oliverio *ο [ἄρο Maas ο [τον]/[ναον* R. Oliverio's reading is careless and his restoration fanciful. The letter *τ* is not preserved: the photograph does not show it, and it is not reported in Oliverio's transcript of letters as distinct from his text. After *ο* there is space at the end of the line for three letters. As to the sense, “the shrine of Artemis” etc. is an unlikely concern amid rules for men in the first instance—rules for women who visit the shrine of Artemis at due times are set out at length further on. On the other hand, Maas's “shrines” seems too broad. The context points to some restricted place, which might be “the temple” of Apollo.

14–15. The break in the stone has mostly swallowed up the last two lines of this five-line section. The previous three lines give little indication of how they should be restored. (Herzog as well as Oliverio offers supplements *in vacuo*.) It is also a question whether a *paragraphos* should be restored before line 16, which embarks on a similar topic. There is no good reason to restore it before line 15, as Herzog did.

16–17.

μ[ὲν ὑπώροφον μianεῖ· τὸν]/[δ' ἐ]ξώροφον Oliverio,
with near certainty.

21. Ἀκαμαντίων is the undoubted reading; the right-hand stroke of A survives at the beginning of the line. Oliverio rightly transcribed but wrongly articulated κα μαντων. Even before this, Maas recognized the name in the light of the context. Dobias-Lalou's transcription [A]καμαντίων —so too in her separate treatment of 1996—is unwarranted. In the past, even the space has sometimes been miscalculated.

22. Dobias-Lalou (1996, 74–75) reads and interprets Βάττω τω τῷ ἄρχαγέτα “some Battus, descendant of the founder,” i.e. τω = τινος; so too in the republication, though less explicitly. On the usual view, adopted here, τῷ {τω} is a dittography.

31. νόμ[ος Ferri νόμ(ος) Wilamowitz νομ(ί)ζεται) Fraenkel. If the photograph shows the final μ, it is very faint indeed. There is no room for any further letters, but the sense indicated by Wilamowitz and Fraenkel follows naturally from what precedes. According to other restorations, the word is completed in the next line.

32. ὀκώχιμος Maas ὀ]ρκώχιμος Wilamowitz
νομ-/ὠκώχιμος Oliverio νομ-/ ὀκώχιμος Buck
κατ-/ὀκώχιμος Sokolowski, forgetful of reality. In fact the photograph leaves no doubt about the reading: ἄκωχιμος. Earlier editors and now Dobias-Lalou are wrong to bring the first letter into question; Wilamowitz's suggestion is doubly impossible. Above and below the line are two identical *paragraphoi*: so Oliverio in his transcript, and so Dobias-Lalou.

Either ὀκώχιμος ΟΓ νομοκώχιμος will be a *hapax*. According to Dobias-Lalou, either “is an acceptable neologism.” She prefers νομοκώχιμος, however, and translates this word and the rest of line 32 “inasmuch as one is bound by the custom up to brothers' children,” attaching it to the sacrifice just mentioned. She also includes νομοκωχιμος in her discussion of unusual words (273–74). The first *paragraphos* she brands as “an error of the lapicide”; so did Oliverio. It seems to me that the net result is to darken understanding of the previous rule about sacrifice and to suppress an important clue to the tithing rules that follow.

The *paragraphos* before line 32 should not be doubted, nor should the line be taken as a fragment of some rule that otherwise eluded the inscriber. The sense of the preceding section, about respecting a

sacrificial custom, is complete with the final word *nom* <os> (lines 26–31). The sense of the following sections about persons and property “tithed” as a hereditary obligation (lines 33–82) agrees with the sense of line 32, which, if taken by itself, defines the extent of a person’s hereditary obligation. Such a heading is both appropriate and consistent with the general format. The tithing rules that follow are the longest section of all, with five subsections of ten lines each. Another long section comprises three subsections dealing with three different forms of a so-called *ἱκέσιος* ritual (lines 111–43). Again there is a manifest heading, the single word *Υεσιων* in large letters (line 110), but this time it does not need to be set off by a second *paragraphos*. And *ἱκέσιος* like *ἄκωχιμος* is an adjective with a noun understood.

39. [πρ]οίκιον vel [ἐν]οίκιον Ferri [...]οικιον Wilamowitz
 σκoίκιον Vogliano [ἐπ]οίκιον Oliverio ἐπ’ οἶκion Sokolowski
 [σκ]οίκιον Dobias-Lalou. Sokolowski’s variation is untenable, but he
 supported it with an ingenious parallel,
μετεδίδου . . . τῶν ἱερῶν εἰς οἶκον Ogi 339.73. This is the
 operative word in the last clause of the first tithing rule; we must
 make sure of it. Though the reading has been diversely reported and
 confused with restoration, the photograph is unmistakable. Vogliano
 was right. -ἄλ- is plain; -κion must be puzzled out but emerges as a
 certainty. σκ- too is certain: the bottom stroke of Σ and the right
 ascending stroke of K can be nothing else.

We expect a utensil, as Wilamowitz remarks. The word *skoikion* is
 used three times in Hellenistic papyri of some kind of household
 “vessel or receptacle” (*LSJ* s.v.): “bronze *skoikion*” (*PTebt* 45 line 41),
 “in a *skoikion*” (*PGissUniv* 10 col. 1 line 9), *skoikia* in a list (*UPZ* 89
 line 17). It has often been adopted here with the meaning “vessel” (so
 now Dobias-Lalou 275–76, 305). But Fraenkel, who gave it general
 currency in *IGDS*, later pointed out that the word is a variant of *koi’x*
 or *koi’s* in the sense of “woven basket”; Pollux glosses *koi’x* as
 “container for barley meal.” The diminutive *koikion* has since
 appeared in other papyri, though of a later date (*LSJ Suppl.* s.v.),
 confirming his analysis and dictating the like pronunciation for
σκοάκion in the papyri and at Cyrene. It is a palm-leaf basket for
 transporting the meat obtained from sacrifice.

40. [ἐφ]ηβος Ferri [ᾗ]νηβος Wilamowitz [ἑ]νηβος Maas
 ἑ]νηβος. Oliverio’s reading has been wrongly ignored.

Above Π the end of a *paragraphos* appears. It departs from the
 perfect symmetry of ten-line sections that are thus marked at lines 33,
 43, 53, and probably 63 and 73.

53. Before this line the end of the expected *paragraphos* can just be made out.

72. Oliverio's transcript and text wrongly give the form $\delta\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ instead of $\delta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$, and it is reproduced in *SEG* 9.72 and elsewhere.

73—82. Though the stone is broken away after line 79, this last section of column A probably extended likewise to ten lines. Much can still be read in lines 73–77, where the surviving text gradually narrows. Surprisingly, no one has tried to make sense of it except Oliverio and Sokolowski, and their restorations are fanciful. I record Oliverio's supplements line by line, together with my own, because they are based on the stone; Sokolowski's have not this value.

We hear as before, throughout the tithing rules of lines 33–72, of sacrificing (73, 74), of purifying (75, 76), of a victim offered “in front of the altar” (77), of carrying away, though to a different destination (77). This cannot be a new subject. Yet Oliverio restores lines 73–78 as a rule pertaining rather to the rites of Artemis that come next in column B. The language there is somewhat similar, about sacrificing and about purifying, but not about any victim “before the altar” or about carrying away, two matters that recur constantly in the tithing rules.

73. $\alpha\rho\kappa\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\lbracket\upsilon\nu$ Oliverio $\lbracket\epsilon\nu\eta\beta\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\lbracket\upsilon\nu$ Sokolowski
 $\lbracket\eta\beta\alpha\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\tilde{\omega}\lbracket\upsilon\nu$ R. ι does not exist; there is space for about eight letters before ν . Oliverio restores the infinitive “to be a Bear,” the title at Athens of girls serving Artemis at a young age, but at Cyrene of her priestess (so line 98). Sokolowski follows suit with a different infinitive, “to be an adolescent” (but the very word is based on a false reading in line 40). The spelling is wrong; a present infinitive has $-\epsilon\nu$. Editors and commentators at large, though refusing restoration and professing uncertainty, often punctuate line 73 so as to present the same syntax: the missing word at the beginning is a complementary infinitive with $\alpha\rho\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, and $\theta\upsilon\epsilon\nu$ is a prescriptive infinitive, and we have a sentence that ends with $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$ “to be *or* do X when he begins, (he is) to sacrifice according to custom.” Yet the inscription has no example of this emphatic order of words, and both the tithing rules and the rules for the ritual of Artemis uniformly employ the prescriptive future tense, not the prescriptive infinitive.

Instead, the main verb is the prescriptive future $\theta\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ in line 74, following two temporal clauses: the first begins with $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ and ends with $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$, and the second ends with the subjunctive $\lbracket\theta\eta\lbracket\upsilon$ in line 74. There is yet another temporal clause at the last. What we miss at the beginning can only be a qualifying adjective with $\epsilon\tilde{\omega}\lbracket\upsilon\nu$ (such adjectives appear in the nominative, with or without $\epsilon\tilde{\omega}\nu$, at lines 33, 40, 53, 58, 63). The necessary meaning follows from the

previous section (see chapter 20, pp. 306–7).

73–74. [αἰ μέγ] / [κα ἄρκος ἐν]θῆι Oliverio
[αἶ κα] / [ἐς γάμον ἐν]θῆι Sokolowski
[ἐπεῖ] / [κα ἐκτιμα]θῆι

R. In line 74 there is again space for about eight letters before]θῆι; the supplements of both Oliverio and Sokolowski are probably too long.

74–77. For the rest of the section, reading and restoration must be expounded here in terms of syntax only; I come to the substance in chapter 20. Lines 75, 76, and 77 each display a main verb near the middle of the line, and the general sense of each main clause is unmistakable. We have only to restore peripheral details. Oliverio's supplements are somewhat in the sense of Athens' Bears, a unique institution (see chapter 21), but they do not support the venture plausibly. Sokolowski, whose supplements I do not reproduce, only repeats or varies Oliverio so that a lad not yet of age, he of line 40, is bound to certain rules of purity in respect of interfering with a maiden, at least until he marries, as line 74 is restored to say. He offers no comment whatever on this seraphic regime.

74–75. δῆλη[ται· αἰ] / [δέ κα μὴ ἐν]θῆι Oliverio
δῆλη[ται· ὥς] / [δέ κα καθάρ]ηι R. In line 74 the first sentence ends with the clause “whenever he wishes,” which is not in doubt. The next sentence begins with another temporal clause: in line 75 there is space for about nine letters before]ηι, and θ does not exist.

75–76. ὅπ[υῖ] τις τ[ὰν δεκέτ]-/[ιν χαλάξει] Oliverio.
ὅπ[όκα] τις τ[ὸ ἰαρὸ]-/[ν κατένθηι] R. The τ read by Oliverio as the last surviving letter of line 75 is no more than the left tip of the cross bar but is likely to be right. The gap before τιο is reckoned at 2 letters by Oliverio, at 4 letters by Dobias-Lalou: it might in fact be either 2 or 3 letters. At the end, after τ, there is space for 4 or 5 letters. Oliverio's supplement is too long. The space at the beginning of line 76 suffices for about 9 letters.

76–77. δῆλη[ται, αἰ δέ κα μ]-/[ή, κάθαρμ]α Oliverio
δῆλη[ται, θύσας βό]-/[τον τέλευν] R. In line 76, about 12 letters are lost at the end. Dobias-Lalou's report is far astray: she reads δῆληται entire and reckons a loss of 4–5 letters after it. In line 77,]α seems illusory. Before προβώμιον, Oliverio reckons 8 letters, Dobias-Lalou 11. I put it at about 9.

77–78. ὅπνι τ[ις τὰν δεκέτιν χ]-/[αλάξει· αἰ ἄ]νθρωπος δ' ἐχάλαξε τ[ὰν παρθένον]

Oliverio ⁸π[υι κα δήληται] R.
78.

[c. 11 litt.] γ.ρω [c. 6 litt.] χα.λεε [c. 11 litt.] Dobias-Lalou [c. 13 litt.]
βω [c. 6 litt.] χα [c. 14 litt.] R.

79. [c. 17 litt.] *ς μεν ἐπ[ιθυσεῖ?* Oliverio]ε[Dobias-Lalou]νε[R.

80–82. Just a trace remains of line 80; the rest of the block is broken away entirely. It is feasible to suppose that column A ended at line 82, making another ten-line section. So too Oliverio and Dobias-Lalou.

Column B

83-84.

μ[έν αὔ κα ἔνθην ἐς τὸ κοιτατῆ]ριον, ζ[αμίαν] / [δεῖ] ἐς Ἀρτ[αμιν θύεν] Oliverio
μ[έν πρὶν ἐνθὲν ἐς κοιτατῆ]ριον ζ[αμίαν] / [δεῖ] ἐς Ἀρτ[αμιν φέρειν] Sokolowski μ[έν
πρὶν ἵμεν τὸ κοιτατῆ]ριον ζ[...]/ [δεῖ] ἐς Ἀρτ[αμιν κατενθὲν] Dobias-Lalou μ[έν
ἴασσαν τὸ κοιτατῆ]ριον ζ[ώναν] / [δεῖ] ἐς Ἀρτ[αμιν λῦσαι]

R. ζ[is certain, consisting of the vertical and the right side of both upper and lower crossbars; after it, just five letters. At the beginning of line 84, just three letters.

A bride goes at once to
τὸ κοιτατῆ]ριον and ἐς Ἀρτ[αμιν, necessary restorations both. It is a single destination that is indicated by one term only in line 86 and in lines 88–89. The missing injunction, whether it is to “go” or to do something else at the same time, may be expressed by *δεῖ* + infinitive, like the coordinate injunction of lines 91–92. The business involves ζ[, an oblique case of a noun, with just six letters if *δεῖ* is restored at the beginning of line 84, according to the likely word order.

ζ[αμίαν] “penalty” has been the choice hitherto. It is indeed a favorite word in this inscription. The bride “sacrifices as *zamia* an animal full grown” at lines 87–88, for failing to go to the bedchamber, and again at line 96, for failing to go the bride-place, and yet again at lines 104–5, for failing to keep pure. The same phrase, “sacrifice as *zamia* an animal full grown,” occurs often in the tithing rules of lines 33–72, as part of the usual obligation, and once elsewhere, at line 31, in the matter of cleansing an altar. Yet the word is not used apart from this phrase, which cannot be restored in lines 83–84 unless in the abbreviated form *ζαμίαν . . . θύεν*. To require this all at once of a bride, and to employ an abbreviated form, is not plausible, especially when the full phrase immediately follows, in the case of a bride who

has been remiss. Nor is it plausible to exempt a bride from a penalty, were we to entertain such a phrase as ζ[αμίας] / [ἄνευ]. “One might think of a kind of sacrifice of expiation owed to the virgin goddess,” says Sokolowski. But this view of Artemis, as an uncompromising virgin, belongs to literature rather than cult.

Sokolowski also proposes ζ[ώναν] “belt” without suggesting any syntax, citing epigrams in the *Anthology* in which a woman’s belt is dedicated to Artemis, Leto, or Eileithyia after childbirth (*LSCG* p. 193 n. 5). Childbirth, however, is not in prospect here; it is first envisaged at line 97. And the ritual will not consist merely of a dedication. Now a bride undoes her belt to lie with the husband, and in lines 84–86 the rule forbids this, lying with the husband, until she goes to Artemis. It is here, at “the bedchamber,” that she first undoes her belt. A ritual disrobing is to be inferred from the mythical disrobing of Artemis’ “nymphs,” such as Callisto. And a ritual disrobing is implicit in the prenuptial custom of bedding a bride with a boy or with the image of a boy. The term “bedchamber” evokes that custom, whether or not it was still enacted with a boy or with an image in fourth-century Cyrene.

The space remaining after necessary restorations just suffices for the infinitive λῦσαι “undo.” According to the *Suda*, the very term λυσιζώνος “belt-undoing” is used of women just before they lie with their husbands for the first time. The entry also says that “they dedicated their own maiden belts to Artemis”; this might well be done at the time of the prenuptial rite or else afterward. The syntax needs to be completed by the participle ἵασσαν “going”: she undoes her belt in going to the bedchamber. Whereas the bride “comes down” or “goes down” to the bride-place, she “comes” or “goes” to the bedchamber. The great sanctuary is at a lower level than the rest of the city, so that one “comes down” to it, and to the area called the “bride-place,” by the processional way. But one simply “comes” to the bedchamber as a room in a building.

91. νύ]μφαν Ferri ν]ύμφαν Oliviero, Dobias-Lalou. It is not important, but the photograph shows no trace of ν.

92. [ὃ τε] Ferri [ὡς] Wilamowitz [ὃτι] De Sanctis [ὥς κα] Oliverio. As to Ἀρταμιτίοις, the last letter cannot be seen in the photograph. After it there is space for two or three letters, but not four, despite Dobias-Lalou, who prefers ὥς κα, unwarrantably: “although the hypothetical particle is not frequent beside ωο before superlative, it is justifiable in a contingent circumstance and fills the lacuna better than the simple ωο proposed by Wilamowitz.”

93-94. [ἐπιθ]-/[υ]σεῖ Wilamowitz ἄ[ποθ]-/[υ]σεῖ Oliverio,

Dobias-Lalou [οὐ θ]-/[υ]σεῖ Calhoun. The last is too short. A is not apparent in the photograph; the surface seems to be destroyed. But this compound, not the other, fits the context. As used by Xenophon and inscriptions, ἀποθύω “insists on the effective realization of a promised sacrifice”: Casabona (1966,95–96). Though the woman omitted to attend a festival of Artemis, “she shall discharge the sacrifice” etc. at just such a festival.

94-98. These lines suffer greatly from the break in the stone.

94-95. ἄ κ[α δῆλητ]αι τοῖς [Ἀρταμιτῖ]-/[οι]ς Ferri
 ἄ κ[α χρῆι κ]αὶ τοῖς [ῆβataῖς] / [ὦ]ς Oliverio
 ἄ κ[α νομίζητ]αι τοῖς [Ἀρταμιτῖ]-/[οι]ς Buck
 ἄ κ[α δῆλητ]αι τοῖς [δ Ἀρταμιτῖ]-/[οι]ς — κ[α
 δολητ]αιτοιο [δ ἀρταμιτο]-/[ἀ]ς Dobias-Lalou. In the first lacuna

Buck’s supplement is too long (Wilamowitz proposed [νομίζετ]αι before κ[α was read). In the second it is harder to judge, but Oliverio’s supplement is probably too short, and DobiasLalou’s possibly too long. As if to illustrate the difficulty, the text of Rhodes and Osborne is an unintelligible conflux of different suggestions and at variance with their translation. As was said, the sense appears to be that the woman shall fulfill her obligation at a festival of Artemis; Ferri’s supplements are to be preferred.

95-96. μὴ κατεληλευ[θυῖα δὲ καθαρῆι τὸ ἱαρ]-/[ὸ]ν

Ferri μὴ κατεληλευ[θυῖα.
 καὶ τόκα δὴ καθαρῆι τὸ ἱαρ]-/[ὸ]ν Oliverio
 μὴ κατεληλευ[θυῖα, καθαρῆι τὸ Ἀρταμιτῖ]-/[ο]ν

Dobias-Lalou. These supplements for the last half of line 95 differ much in length: 18 letters Ferri, 25 letters Oliverio, 21 letters DobiasLalou. Dobias-Lalou’s supplement would be longer with a connective, δο or καο, which she omits only in virtue of her supplement in line 95. Now the last surviving letter of κατεληλευ[is directly under — in line 94, which is followed by 18 letters, and directly under ± in line 93, which is followed by 21 letters. Ferri’s supplement, which gives good sense, has the only chance of being right.

97. [νύμφα κύασσα πρὶν τεκὲν κάτε]ιτι Ferri

[ν. κυοῖσα π. τ. κ.] Latte νύμφα
 ἐπεὶ κα διακορήθηι κάτε]ιτι Oliverio
 [γυνὰ κύοισα πρὶν τεκὲν κάτε]ιτι DobiasLalou.

The sense is evident from the context. It is another rule for a bride, this time after she conceives. It is not when she is deflowered (Oliverio), nor is it for

a married woman whenever she conceives (Dobias-Lalou).

98. *ἐς Ἀρταμιν [αὐτὰ] καὶ τῇ* Oliverio
ἐς Ἀρταμιν[ν . . .]τῇ Dobias-Lalou *ἐς*
Ἀρταμιν· [αὐτὰ δὲ τ]ῇ R. Nothing can be discerned in the
photograph between *Ἀρταμιν[and]τῇ* these letters being
represented only by the slightest traces, which could hardly be
interpreted but for the context. Oliverio reckons 8 letters between
them, too many; Dobias-Lalou reckons 5, too few. I supply 7,
admittedly a tight fit.

108. *αὐτὰ vel αὐτα* Ferri. A question of interpretation: is it
“the house itself” or “this house”? The latter was afterwards preferred
by Ferri and has been generally adopted, as now by Dobias-Lalou.
Opinions differ as to which agrees better with lines 16–20, where the
pollution of childbirth affects the actual house, as well as persons in it.
But Calhoun (1934, 346) maintains that the passages do not agree and
that in line 108 *αὐτα* points to the household as distinct from the
house.

110. *ἱκεσίων* is inscribed in letters larger and very widely
spaced so as to fill up the line.

111-31. It is fortunate that the text of these lines, the first two
forms of *hikesios* ritual, is almost entirely free from difficulty, since the
meaning is often curious.

114. The perfect tenses refer to the condition of the dead man, to
whether he lies in a grave or is unburied as a result of drowning or
other misadventure. The usual interpretation wrongly treats them as
aorists.

122. How we punctuate this line and the next has large
consequences for the meaning. The noun phrase (the noun being
understood) *ἱκέσιος ἄτερος, τετελεσμένος ἢ ἀτελής* is
coordinate with that of line 111, *ἱκέσιος, ἐπακτός*, and that of
line 132, *ἱκέσιος τρίτος, αὐτοφόνος*. Those phrases stand
alone; each is directly followed by the first sentence of the rule. This
phrase is directly followed by a nominative participle,
ἰσάμενος κτλ. It is possible to attach the participle to the noun
phrase, which accordingly refers to a person, to one “sitting down”,
etc. The other phrases would then refer to other persons. But it is
equally possible to attach the participle to the following sentence, an
injunction ending with a prescriptive infinitive (nominative +
prescriptive infinitive is a common enough construction). So the
analogy of lines 111 and 132 would dispose us; so Wilamowitz takes it
without ado; so do I. But the great majority of commentators, as now
Dobias-Lalou, take it the other way.

126. $\epsilon^2[\kappa]$ Ferri $\epsilon^2[\gamma]$ Wilamowitz $\epsilon^2[s]$ Maas. The undoubted meaning of the prepositional phrase is “anew,” and κ or γ + genitive seems an obvious choice; the latter is indicated by the same phonetic spelling in the next line (so Wilamowitz). Maas argues for o + an accusative form that is probably nonexistent (cf. Gow on Theocr. *Id.* 15.143): “an excess of erudition,” as Dobias-Lalou rightly says (2000, 309, cf. 52III06). Apart from the supplement, the preceding word

$\pi\alpha\rho\tilde{\eta}\iota$ can be interpreted in two ways, as the compound of $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\iota$, i.e. “he omits it” (so nearly everyone) or, with differing punctuation, of

$\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\iota$, i.e. “he presents himself anew” (so Buck). Dobias-Lalou (2000, 306) gives the former rendering, but her comment on the word (153) does not show that she has considered Buck’s point about the spelling. With the latter rendering, however, diligence is punished, which seems unlikely. Otherwise, it is not an important question.

127. $\epsilon^2\pi[\alpha\chi]-/\theta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$ Ferri $\epsilon^2\gamma\lambda[a]-/\theta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$

Wilamowitz $\epsilon^2\pi\iota[\lambda a]-/\theta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$ Oliverio. The last preserved letter may be either Γ or Π lacking the right leg. Nothing can be seen of the *I* read by Oliverio and now by Dobias-Lalou. There is hardly space for this and two more letters. The word supplied by Wilamowitz is to be preferred; his placement of the dot and the bracket are mistaken.

130-31. $[\tau\epsilon\iota]-/\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ Ferri $[\theta\acute{\upsilon}]-/\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ Wilamowitz
 $[\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}]-/\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ De Sanctis $[\chi\rho\acute{\eta}]-/\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ Maas. The loss is probably of three letters. Maas’s supplement, to “ask the oracle,” suits this context of repeated consultations; it has been generally adopted. To “sacrifice *for himself*” rather than to a deified ancestor is the meaning intended by Wilamowitz; these alternatives are very dubious; and the meaning does not agree with the ordinary use of the middle form, to sacrifice with a certain end in view (Casabona [1966, 86–87]). To “supplicate” is too indefinite. Likewise to “make amends,” Ferri’s meaning—but it is not attested (see *LSJ* s. $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ II 6).

132-41. Whereas the first form of *hikesios* ritual occupies 12 lines and the second form occupies 11 lines, the third form occupies 10 lines before the stone breaks off entirely. Less remains of each successive line as the stone narrows on either side, but as far as line 136, the first letter of each line can still be made out. A connected sense is evident down to line 140. Whether the section ended after another line and a half or continued a little further is impossible to say.

After that, there was still room for another 15–20 lines (so Oliverio, with the actual stone before him). But the overall arrangement could be regarded as complete with these three forms of *hikesios* ritual.

132-33. [τρι]-/πολίαν Ferri [ἐπι]-/πολίαν De Sanctis
 [ἀρχε]-/πολίαν Oliverio [δικασ]-/πολίαν Sokolowski
 [θυη]-/πολίαν Masson [ἄλλο]-/πολίαν Burkert
 [ἱαρο]-/πολίαν R. The loss is of 3 or 4 letters, but not of 3 letters including I, as in the supplements of Ferri and De Sanctis. It is a cruel loss. Both morphology and meaning need to be discussed (chapter 22, pp. 366–67).

133-34. καταγγήλε[ι ἰκέ]-/σθαι Ferri
 καταγγήλε[ι δέκε]-/σθαι R. After [I], to be supplied with certainty, there follows the same space for three or four letters as in the previous line. Ferri's supplement, "that he has come," refers to the person being purified; it has always been taken as self-evident. But the intercessor whose role is now clarified by an inscription of Lindus is the subject of the two main verbs in lines 132–34 and probably of the infinitive as well. If so, he announces "that he is receiving."

134-35. λευκῶ[ι ἴ]-/ζεν Ferri λευκῶ[ι νί]-/ζεν Maas
 λευκῶ[ι κλύ]-/ζεν De Sanctis λευκιμ[ονί]-/ζεν Oliverio.
 After κ, the loop of Ω is of the faintest. If it exists, but there is nothing to dispose us to Oliverio's reading and the *hapax* he restores (it does not consort with λευχείμων and λευχειμονέω, words he cites). Dobias-Lalou offers no comment on the reading but helpfully includes the *hapax* in a list of "discarded words" (309). κλύζεν rather than νίζεν would fill the space.

135. δαμοσί[αν Ferri. There is room for at least one more letter, but the inscriber chose to begin a new line with a new word. Was he then approaching the end of his text?

136–37. ἔωντ[ι τὸ]-/[s] Wilamowitz ἔωντ[ι ᾠμ'] Latte (this ignores the space at the beginning of the next line).

137–38. προαγγελῆν[τα· ἐς ἰα]-/[ρὸ]ν Wilamowitz
 προαγγελτῆ[ρα Maas προαγγελτε[ιρα· ἐπὶ ἰα]-/[ρῶ]ν
 Oliverio. Either προαγγελτῆ[or προαγγελτε[might be read from the photograph, but space admits no more than six letters thereafter.

138–41. Dobias-Lalou's report of these lines is quite mistaken; likewise her indication of line 142. So too in her separate study (2001, 620).

138-39. λυτηρί]-/[ων θε]ῶν Latte
 ἀφικετευ[ό]μενο[ν τῶν δαμο]-/[τελ]ῆων Oliverio
 ἐπὶ τῶν] / [θυσ]ιῶν R. In line 138 Oliverio's supplement

exceeds the space. As the first preserved letter of line 139 I see the tall outline of I, hence [θυσ] ιων. If this outline were illusory, a crack at the left might be the top stroke of Σ, to give the reading [·]σων.

139–40. [ἀναμένειν ἐξοῖ· ὁ] / [δὲ θ]ύσει Wilamowitz
 [στεφανωθέντας· ὁ] Latte [βοηθὲν τὰ δίκαια· ὁ] Oliverio
 [ἔπεσενθὲν. ὡς δέ] / [κα θ]ύσει R. In line 139 the last surviving letter ἐπομονοΣ [is directly beneath these indicated letters, ἀψικετον[ς]μενο[ν] in line 138 and προαγγελτη[ρα] in line 137, which are respectively followed by 12 and 13 letters as restored. In line 139 the length of competing restorations is as follows: 13 letters Wilamowitz, 14 letters Latte, 15 letters Oliverio, 13 letters R. In respect of length, as well as of sense, the only choice is between “remain outside” and “come in after him.”

140–41.

ἀλλα [δωροτελεσεῖ τῷ ἀρχαγέτ]-/[αι θεῶι, αἰ] δὲ μή[

Oliverio ἄλλα [τὰ νομιζόμενα Casabona.

141.]εμη[Only these letters can be read. The space before them, of about nine letters, was correctly judged by Oliverio. Though any supplement is guesswork, τὰ δ]ἔ μή[ρια suits the context.

Some General Rules

Synopsis

The whole inscription can be summarized as follows.

- Apollo's oracle (lines 1-3)
- miscellaneous general rules (lines 4-20)
- Akamantes and Tritopateres (lines 21-31)
- tithed persons and properties (lines 32-82)
- a bride's devotions, with another general rule (lines 83-109)
- three different forms of purifying ritual (lines 110-42)

The present chapter explains the arrangement, then deals with the oracle and miscellaneous general rules.

The Setting and the Contents

The marble block stood somewhere in the great sanctuary of Apollo in the northwest part of the city, below the acropolis at the southwest—it was reused in the Roman Baths east of the sanctuary (the same abundant springs supply them both). Much of the ritual takes place at this sanctuary, and Apollo is concerned in still other items.

All the rules are ascribed to the Delphic oracle (lines 1-3). The very first calls for sacrifice to Apollo outside a city gate, which is probably the north gate next to the sanctuary (lines 4-7). As a practical matter, wood is made available from sacred land belonging to Apollo, somewhere outside the city (lines 8-10). In the longest section a “tithed” class of citizens offer sacrifice in Apollo's sanctuary on a very large scale (lines 32-82). Artemis shares the sanctuary, and the next longest section requires young women to visit her shrine at due times (lines 83-105). A certain form of purification consists of inquiry at Apollo's oracle, perhaps on the south side of the sanctuary (lines 122-31). Another form, the most public and demonstrative, leads up to a sacrifice in the sanctuary that is attended by a body of

witnesses (lines 132-41).

The only definite worship outside Apollo's sanctuary is that of *Akamantes* and *Tritopateres*, at a number of shrines belonging to priestly families; this worship is now put on a new footing (lines 21-31). Miscellaneous items include scruples about keeping pure (lines 11-20, 106-9) and, as another form of purification, the exorcism of a house (lines 111-21).

The contents are divided on the stone into sections or subsections by some twenty *paragraphoi* (a few must be restored). It is not really helpful to number all the sections as a single series, the usual practice of editors and commentators. Only the larger divisions just indicated are significant. Furthermore, the numbering cannot serve for easy reference because it has often varied through some slight disagreement or even inadvertency.¹

The Delphic Oracle

Apollo ordained: dwell in Libya forever using purifications and abstinences and [supplications].

The rules are announced as a Delphic oracle, and the announcement poses a question of meaning. Was the oracle issued long ago, as at the founding of Cyrene, or just now, in response to a consultation by the city? At the time of the inscription, every reader knew the circumstances, but we do not. The twoword heading "Apollo ordained" necessarily evokes the famous and muchembroidered story of Cyrene's founding at the insistence of Delphi. It might introduce a contemporary dispensation as well. But then we expect the formula by which any new *imprimatur* of the Delphic oracle is always cited, most often for ritual measures like these rules: "it is better and more good to" do such and so.² The omission would be unique in the epigraphic record.

This is not a decisive consideration. It remains possible that Delphi newly authorized the rules. They originate at Cyrene in any case, amid conditions that can sometimes be deduced from the language.

Sacrifice at the City Gates

If sickness or [famine] or death come against the land or against the city, sacrifice in front of the city gates, [facing] the Averter, to Apollo the averter a red he-goat.

In time of need, a red he-goat will be sacrificed at the gate. The magic force of the color red is discussed below. For the rest, this first rule

makes use of a solemn public rite that is already known to everyone. The gate in question is likely to be the north gate that adjoins Apollo's sanctuary.³ A main street leads west from the city at large to both the sanctuary and the gate; the gate opens on the road to the port of Apollonia, the first road that was ever marked out at Cyrene.

Just the same offering with just the same prominence appears at the head of a *lex sacra* of the second century B.C. that sets forth a long list of regular offerings to civic deities. It throws some light on this earlier rule. After a single line that is lost it begins, "to the Winds, a goat; to Apollo *apotropaïos* a goat, in fact a he-goat" (*SECir* 158 = *LS Suppl.* 116 A 2–5). The designation of the victim is curiously emphatic: αἶξ, μάλα χίμαρος.⁴ Other victims specified hereafter are merely the animal species, αἶξ "goat," ὄς "pig," οἷς "sheep." So the he-goat of Apollo *apotropaïos* is a proud tradition. For the rest, the exact scope or purport of the later document escapes us.⁵ But the cults named, mostly of Apollo, Zeus, and Athena with distinctive epithets, are likely to be civic cults distributed throughout the city. We may review them briefly.

"The Winds" are not unsuited to a location outside the north gate, beside Apollo. At Athens we find Boreas on the Ilissus bank outside the south city wall and the *Tritopatreis* in their principal instance just outside the north city wall, at the Dipylon. Next after the Winds and Apollo *apotropaïos* come Zeus *hyperphoreus* and the *Telessai*, who may well be the *Moirai* (A 6–12).⁶ But the cults named, mostly of Apollo, Zeus, and Athena with distinctive epithets, are likely to be civic cults distributed throughout the city. We may review them briefly.

"The Winds" are not unsuited to a location outside the north gate, beside Apollo. At Athens we find Boreas on the acropolis. Next again come two joint cults of Zeus and Athena, sharing the epithets *pantheios* and *hypellaios* respectively, which would likewise suit the acropolis (A 13–17).⁷ Then come cults of *Iatros*, of Zeus without an epithet, of Ammon, and of "those round the temple" (A 1821). *Iatros* and a partner *Iaso* are otherwise represented by substantial dedications; Ammon of course is well known at Cyrene.⁸ Then come cults of *Iatros*, of Zeus without an epithet, of Ammon, and of "those round the temple" is the focus here, and if it belongs to Zeus, it is likely to be the great temple on the eastern hill, an eminence that matches the acropolis on the west. The second column so far as it survives continues with deities defined by location, "those in the shrine of Athena," "those in the agora and those in the *prytaneion*" (B 5–9).⁹ At the last we meet cults of *Paian* and "the *parhedroi*," of Nymphs, and again of Apollo and the Nymphs (B 10–16).

The designation of offerings is everywhere of the simplest—only the animal species, except in the case of Zeus *hyperphoreus*, who

receives bloodless offerings carefully prescribed, just like Zeus *hypatos* on Athens' Acropolis. The entire list is a statutory round of old cults honored at a certain time or by a certain official group. The only order that seems feasible is topographic and will include the following: Apollo *apotropaios* at the north gate, shrines of the acropolis, temple of Zeus, shrines of the agora. Thus the great sanctuary of Apollo is represented by Apollo *apotropaios* and by him alone. Our body of rules, in beginning with a sacrifice to this deity, follows some official practice.

A he-goat is a traditional offering to Apollo generally, not only at this emblematic shrine beside the city gate. As a pastoral deity, a function that was undoubtedly to the fore at Cyrene, Apollo prefers the ungelded males of both sheep and goat, *krios* and *chimaros* / *tragos*.¹⁰ On Naxos he has the epithet *tragios* "of the he-goat" (Steph. Byz. s. *Tragia*). Cleonae, in time of plague (a case envisaged at Cyrene, if we restore *λοι/μός* instead of *λι/μός*), was instructed by the Delphic oracle to sacrifice a he-goat, albeit "to the rising sun" (Paus. 10.11.5). Also in the Argolid, a large quantity of goat horns are reported from the temple of Apollo at Halieis.¹¹ At Lindus, at some unidentified shrine of Apollo, a *chimaros* "he-goat" is sacrificed by "the eldest of the *phyletai*," a civic unit (SEO 38.786 = Lupu [2005, no. 16], c. 250 b.c.). Crete too provides ample evidence of he-goats offered to Apollo.¹²

Apart from Naxos, all these instances belong to Dorian areas of Greece that are somehow linked with Cyrene. Lindus was founded by settlers from the Argolid (Il. 2.656, etc.), and Lindus helped to found or to reinforce Cyrene (*Lindos* 2 no. 1 B 17, the *Register* of Athena's temple). So did Crete, and the city of Oaxus in particular. Now Lindus and Oaxus offer further parallels, far more striking ones, to our inscription. The tithing rules call for sacrifice to Apollo on a large scale so as to produce a quantity of meat; sacrifice of such a kind is attested by a whole class of Lindian inscriptions—and this custom too appears to derive from the Argolid (chapter 20, pp. 308–11). A similar sacrifice is documented at Oaxus (chapter 20, p. 316). The final rule for purifying oneself by an elaborate sacrificial procedure calls for an "intercessor," a word and an office occurring also at Lindus (chapter 22, pp. 365–66).

An old custom then, probably a distinctive Dorian custom. It is now the remedy appointed for a time of sudden need—"if sickness or [famine] or death come against the land or against the city." Similar language, a sending rather than a coming, is used later, near the end, for the first of three forms of *hikesios* ritual: "if something be sent against the house" (lines 111–12). The later rule is a magical defense against a magical attack: one fashions figurines and entertains them

with a meal so as to fend off ghosts that have been conjured against a house. To sacrifice a red he-goat is another magical defense, now adapted from an old custom. Why must it be red? A victim's color is not often specified—it is not specified hereafter in any of the many rules for sacrifice.¹³ Red hair goes with magic.¹⁴ Either this is a worthless creature to be rid of, or else it is the very embodiment of harm—or is it the very embodiment of vitality, a substitute offering? There is no system to such things; they are ambiguous by nature. Magic was in the air at Cyrene. The authorities took note, even though they themselves and many like them were not accustomed to conjuring with figurines and red hair. They carefully imported magic into the formulation of the very first rule and again of another rule near the end, rules for purifying the city and for purifying a house.

Magic famously appears in a somewhat earlier inscription of Cyrene, of the first half of the fourth century (Meiggs and Lewis, *GHI* 5).¹⁵ The city grants equal rights to persons from Thera now residing at Cyrene and subjoins a document recalling the foundation by Thera. The founders, both those who went forth to Cyrene and those who stayed at home, reputedly swore an oath and reinforced it by melting wax figurines, so as to signify the fate of transgressors (lines 40–51). The inscription was published a year or two before ours, and the melting of figurines was remarked at the time as a unique instance of virtual black magic in a public document.¹⁶ Yet it suits the imaginary circumstances of the oath. The oath takers are all the people of Thera, men and women, boys and girls: all may be involved, now or in the future, in the colonizing enterprise. Accordingly, they all submit themselves to individual retribution by this binding act of private magic. In fourth-century Cyrene, the fiction has the effect of enforcing the new decree, of forestalling objections by jealous Cyrenaeanes.

In the present rule the authorities are to perform the magic. They go out to the city gate with a red he-goat, and the animal is consecrated by a priest of Apollo, probably the senior figure who is the year's eponym. The promised ritual is by way of example and encouragement. All the rules hereafter, a curious assortment, are for individual persons and individual needs or obligations. The persons may be of greater or lesser means, the needs or obligations may be more or less serious, the procedures may be elaborate or simple. The rules associate everyone, and the authorities first of all, in due observance of old custom.

In Search of Wood

Wood growing on sacred land. If you put up the price for the god, you can use the wood equally for sacred and for ordinary and for tainted use.

It is helpful to be informed straightway of the scope of the rule: “wood growing on sacred land.” Whereas τὸ ἱερόν, τὰ ἱερά refer hereafter to certain shrines, of Apollo or Artemis or the *Akamantes* or *Tritopateres*, ἐν ἱερῷ refers to a sacred area belonging to Apollo, “the god”: it must be woodland outside the city. Only this rule and the three last are introduced by a phrase indicating the content. The three last are forms of *hikesios* ritual that need to be distinguished from each other. This rule differs, as a practical concern, from all the other rules of piety. The phrase advertises the availability of wood.

To pay the price is ἐρεῖσες, a colloquial expression. In Theocritus’ fifth *Idyll*, a singing match in southern Italy, the goatherd pledges a kid and calls on the shepherd to do likewise: ἄμνόν ἐρειδε “put up a lamb” (Id. 5.24).¹⁷ The wood may then be used for any purpose, fully indicated as either ἱερά “sacred” or βοβαλα “ordinary” or μαρά “tainted.” It is customary language, though we find it only here.¹⁸ The uses of wood are in fact as timber for handicrafts and as firewood for cooking, sacrifice, and cremation. These are readily aligned with the categories of the inscription—sacrifice is a “sacred” use, cooking is “ordinary,” cremation is “tainted.” All handicrafts may be “ordinary,” or else articles made for worship are “sacred” and those for funerals, notably the bier, are “tainted.”

Why this provision is so useful we can only guess. Wood is always needed, and warnings are often given against cutting or gathering wood in a sacred grove.¹⁹ Here the wood is to be sold and at a usual price. It would seem that the purchase of wood from Apollo’s sacred land was normally restricted but is now conceded to everyone. The restriction must have been to wealthy and privileged persons; the concession must be to the ordinary man.

The Pollution of Intercourse and Childbirth

A man coming from a woman with whom he has lain at night shall sacrifice [whenever] he wishes. If he has lain with her by day, after washing himself [thoroughly], he shall go wherever he wishes except into [the temple. —].

Sexual intercourse is polluting, like other bodily functions. To respect this—“not to go unwashed from women into shrines”—is distinctive of Egyptians and Greeks, says Herodotus with his usual chauvinism (2.64.1).²⁰ Obviously, the compunction will be seldom noticed in literature, unless in comedy and the like, and we shall not find regulations posted at a given shrine until a later period when individual piety is more important. This rule at Cyrene is the earliest of instances that grow ever more common—and that are commonest and strictest in cults of foreign deities, refuting Greek chauvinism (Herodotus refutes himself in speaking of Babylon).²¹

At Cyrene the native Libyans were accorded more respect, of necessity, than native peoples living next to Greek colonies elsewhere (cf. chapter 20, p. 317). They may have influenced this rule (as they were much influenced themselves, during long ages, by the puritanical Egyptians). It is striking in any case that the matter is regulated by the authorities. All other such inscriptions, and they are many, pertain to a particular shrine, and represent the custom there preferred.²² Just as the wood offered for sale belongs to Apollo's sacred land, the restrictions here announced refer only to the sanctuary of Apollo; many other deities worshipped at Cyrene would expect much more than this.

One is permitted to sacrifice straightway (according to the likeliest supplement) after normal nighttime intercourse.²³ After daytime intercourse one may go to the sanctuary only if one washes thoroughly and even then not to or into a particular place, which might be the temple, here restored *exempli gratia*. (Some later rules expressly concern entry to a temple, but only because it represents the worship in general.)

A woman in childbed shall pollute the house. She shall pollute anyone inside. She shall not pollute anyone outside if he does not go in. Any person who is inside shall himself be polluted for three days. This person shall not pollute anyone else no matter where he goes in.

Childbirth, like intercourse, is polluting.²⁴ It is more polluting as it is more drastic. Presumably the mother and the house are polluted for the three days that apply to anyone else inside.²⁵ Miscarriage is polluting too, but we do not hear of it until lines 106–9. That pollution lasts as long as after childbirth if the fetus is not fully formed; if it is indeed fully formed, pollution lasts as long as after death in the house.²⁶ Now miscarriage is appended to the rules for a bride and a pregnant woman, of quite a different character. They consist of careful directions for sacrificing to Artemis, not unlike the directions for sacrificing in the sanctuary of Apollo, i.e. the tithing rules, which are very long and very costly. Miscarriage is mentioned there when it might equally, or better, follow childbirth. The pollution of death, though referred to off-handedly, is not covered anywhere.

All these instances of bodily pollution are treated summarily, even carelessly. The language and the arrangement are careless; it is careless to omit death while including the other things. There is nothing to be done anyway, except in one case to wash thoroughly. They only give a sanctimonious appearance. Much more substantial matters immediately follow, the use of certain rites and shrines and the tithing obligation.

1. For example, the two latest treatments, by Dobias-Lalou (2000) and by Rhodes and Osborne, GE197, number 1–20 and 1–21 respectively, because for Rhodes and Osborne line 32 is a separate section—even though they take it as “background” to the tithing rules that follow (line 110 also looks forward to the three forms of purification that follow). Sokolowski, *LS Suppi.* 115, divides and numbers differently from everyone else, 1–8 according to the sense, somewhat as I do, but not quite.

2. In every surviving inscription on stone that cites the Delphic oracle for particular measures, from c. 450 B.C. to the first century A.D., the formula appears if the relevant part is preserved. See Fontenrose (1978, 14) and, in his catalogue of “historical responses” (244–67), H 2, 19, 21, 25, 27, 32, 33, 36, 38, 39, 45, 47, 54, 61, 74. On this criterion ours should be evicted from its place as H 26. Parker (1983, 333), cf. Parker (2004, 63), suggests that in the present case Delphi’s response “was confined to the general instruction to ‘live in Libya observing purifications,’” but such a general response is unparalleled.

3. So Dobias-Lalou (2000, 307 and Plan 3). But the averter monument or statue that is ἐναντίον “facing” the gate (her chosen supplement) she thinks of as somewhere within Apollo’s sanctuary. This does not seem possible.

4. Pugliese-Carratelli makes it μᾶλα “apples. Sokolowski and Laronde (1987, 425) interpret μᾶλα rightly but χίμαρος wrongly, as “a young goat.” Despite its etymological sense, the word is nearly always a general term for a he-goat of any age. When a young he-goat is meant, it is otherwise expressed (note 9); so it would be here, especially.

5. The offerings are surely not in calendar order, as Pugliese-Carratelli suggests, and there is nothing of any mystical, syncretistic, or moralizing tendency such as Sokolowski imagines. Laronde (1987, 425–27) sees no guiding thread at all, though he rightly speaks of “old civic cults.”

6. Sokolowski very aptly adduces Zeus *hypatos* on the Acropolis of Athens (both cults demand bloodless offerings) and *teleiai* as a title of the *Moirai* at Delphi.

7. The epithet ὑπελλαῖος is peculiar, apparently a compound of ὑπέρ and λαός. So regarded, it is compared by Pugliese-Carratelli with συλλάνιος at Sparta, likewise applied to Zeus and Athena jointly, and by Sokolowski with ὑπερδέξιος, sometimes so applied. Neither analogy is convincing. Is it an altered form of ἀπελλαῖος, referring to a civic body or a civic unit called ἀπέλλα?

8. *Iatros* and *Iaso*: Dobias-Lalou (2000, 225–26). Ammon: Dobias-Lalou (2000, 214–15).

9. The *prytaneion* may be singled out as an element of the agora; it is conjecturally identified with a peristyle building on the south side (chapter 22, n. 52).

10. The word *chimaros* is a general term for a he-goat of any age, like *tragos*. Etymologically, however, it signifies a yearling he-goat that has lived through its first “winter”; the animals were spared this long as tractable and toothsome. The general use arose just because it was natural to specify a young animal as a minimum, not an exclusive, requirement for sacrifice. If none but a yearling animal will serve, as in the worship of Dionysus, it is labeled unmistakably *tragos pratenios* (*LS Suppi.* 104 lines 4–5, Cos, first century B.C.). Dionysus is another deity with a penchant for goat sacrifice, but in a different style. A yearling is sacrificed at an early stage of the grape and wine cycle; the god himself as a virtual kid has the

expressive epithet *eiraphiotes* < *eriphos* (the spelling with a *i* is due to folk etymology, as if he had been sewn into Zeus' thigh, *rhaptô*). At the end of the cycle a vigorous, unruly buck is sacrificed to the mature god, himself prepotent in figurative union with some local beauty. It too is labeled unmistakably *chimaros kallisteuon* (LSCG 96 line 27, Myconos, c. 220–200 B.c.).

11. Mazarakis Ainian (1997, 163–64).

12. At Drerus the horns of young goats are reported for the temple of Apollo in the agora: Mazarakis Ainian (1997, 217), Sporn (2002, 82–83). Coins of Tylissus feature Apollo's head and goat horns: Sporn (2002, 145).

13. At Nacone in western Sicily “a white she-goat” is sacrificed after factions are reconciled, and each year henceforth a victim that is presumably the same will be offered to the ancestors and to *Eomonoia*: SEG 30.1119 = Lupu (2005, no. 26 lines 27–33), late fourth or mid-third century. This is the embodiment of *candor*, so to speak.

14. So Latte (1928, 41–42), citing parallels, to which add Fiedler (1931, 80–81, 95) on weather magic. See too Parker (1983, 275, 334–35).

15. Such is the date assigned by Chamoux (1953, 105).

16. So Nock (1926). The word *kolossoi* “figurines” is the same as at lines 117, 121 below. It is a special use of a word that seems to denote an ancient and typical statue shape, columnar or trunklike. Despite Dickie (1996), this meaning remains feasible, though with some modification of the thesis originally argued by G. Roux. Dickie (1996, 240–41) holds that the *kolossoi* of the oath-taking ceremony are necessarily “either life-size or greater” since a large body of citizens on Thera watch them melt. This hardly follows even for an actual ceremony. It does not follow at all if the ceremony was only imagined in fourth-century Cyrene.

17. So Gow *ad loc.*, observing that “the required sense is *τίθει*, or *κατατίθει*.” Dover *ad loc.* less feasibly thinks of a verb of motion, “make... go,” as if the lamb were to be pushed forward (Macmillan [1971]).

18. The usual comment is too vague, or in the case of Dobias-Lalou (2000, 205) too abstract. “The essential opposition is that of the pair *hiaros* / *babalos*, while *mīaros* represents an extreme case of the category *babalos* and an especially antinomic case of *hiaros*, all the more since these antinomic concepts have rhyming designations” [i.e. -ζαρος].

19. Wood, like any staple, is most needed in time of difficulty, such as the first rule envisages. A familiar story plays on this predicament. When Athens was beset by Dorian invaders, Codrus the king went forth to meet his death disguised as a

woodcutter gathering wood. As a variant of *κέδρος* “juniper,” commonest of

trees or shrubs, *Κόδρος* exemplifies the need of wood, and the story was told for its own sake long before Codrus was enrolled in the odd assortment of figures that constitutes Athens' royal line: Robertson (1988, 224–30).

20. See Fehrle (1910, 25–42), Parker (1983, 74–79).

21. Cf. Ziehen, LSG 2 no. 117, Eresus, s. II ante (= LSCG 124), exacting rules of purity for some deity unknown but surely not Greek; Lupu (2005, 205–13), the same for Isis and Sarapis at Megalopolis.

22. In LSAM 12, Pergamum, s. II p. post., rules for the cult of Athena *nikêphoros*, the matter of purification from intercourse, funerals, and childbirth is followed by two civic decrees concerning revenues from the cult, but only because the priest chose to so present them. Cf. Parker (2004, 63).

23. Sokolowski regards the sacrifice as a penalty, which would be extraordinary; cf. Parker (1983, 74n4, 335).

24. See Wächter (1910, 25–28), Parker (1983, 48–53, 352–53).

25. There is no particular remedy. It is a curiosity that at Athens a new mother is fed cabbage“as an antidote” (Ath. 9.10, 370c, cited by Wachter.)

26. The rules for childbirth and miscarriage are parallel if οἰκία in line 108 signifies the same as the“roof” and the house otherwise intimated in lines 16–20. The Superstitious Man avoids the house, as it must be, in case of either birth or death (Theophr. *Char.* 16.9, cited by Parker [1983, 51n73]). In line 108 Calhoun (1934, 346) insists on the meaning“the family, the membership of the household, *not* the house” (my emphasis); Stukey (1937, 34) agrees; Parker (1983, 50, 346) leaves the question open. But the altered meaning could not possibly be grasped unless it were plainly stated (whether we understand αὐτὰ ἡ οἰκία or αὐτα is immaterial).

Akamantes and Tritopateres

Synopsis

It has not been grasped that the next two sections belong together. The first of them has seemed uniquely difficult, yielding almost no sense. There are two main reasons. *Akamantes* and *Tritopateres* go unrecognized as agrarian deities of a certain kind, each with several cults belonging to several priestly clans. And the language is indeed strained, being derogatory of priestly clans. The rule in fact announces that these cults are now thrown open to everyman, without assistance by the clans. The premier cult of *Akamantes*, that of Battus' clan, is excepted. We cannot be sure, and a Cyrenaean reader could hardly be sure, whether the premier cult of *Tritopateres*, that of Onymastus' clan, is excepted or included. A circular altar recently discovered in the agora of Cyrene, well suited to wind gods, may be that of the premier cult of *Akamantes*.

The following section provides a simple remedy if a sacrifice is botched by a lay person: a thorough cleansing of the altar.

The Problem

Next come two sections of five and six lines, 21–25 and 26–31, which belong together, though this has not been recognized. The latter section is straightforward and can be dealt with briefly at the end. But the five lines awarding or denying *όσια* “(lawful) use,” of things in the genitive to persons in the dative, are a notorious conundrum. They have never been translated or interpreted in any satisfactory way. Parker in 1983 described the difficulties and the desperate attempts to grapple them.¹ Dobias-Lalou in 1996 offered a new interpretation (though of course it builds on earlier ones), and with this we should begin, since it shows that all the difficulties still remain. The Greek needs to be reproduced once more— nearly every word is problematical.

Ἀκαμαντίων ὅσια παντὶ καὶ ἀγνῶι καὶ βαβάλω[i].
 πλὰν ἀπ' ἀνθρώπῳ Βάττω τῷ {τω} ἀρχαγέτα καὶ
 Τριτοπατέρων καὶ ἀπὸ Ὀνυμάστῳ τῷ Δελφῶ{i},
 ἀπ' ἄλλῳ ὅπῃ ἀνθρώπος ἔκαμε, οὐκ ὅσια ἀγνῶ<ι>·
 τῶν δὲ ἱερῶν ὅσια παντί.

The literal meaning that Dobias-Lalou makes out is as follows.² “To shrines / rites of *Akamantes* there is access for everyone both pure and profane.³ Except from the man Battus the founder and (from) *Tritopateres* and from Onymastus the Delphian, from any other (place) where a man lies dead, there is not access for someone pure.⁴ To the shrines / rites (of the gods) there is access for everyone.”

“Pure” and “profane,” *hagnos* and *babalos*, are priest and lay person. This we may accept—it is commonly agreed—though it is striking that they are placed on the same footing in a religious matter. It is a question, says Dobias-Lalou, of access to shrines / rites expressed by objective genitives, and this too we may accept, though it remains to determine what *hosia* “access” implies. The rest of her interpretation seems awkward and improbable.

She finds just two objective genitives, “of *Akamantia*” in the first line and “of the *hiara*” in the last line. *Akamantia* are of course shrines / rites of powers called *Akamantes*—and these, we are told, are heroes as a class, inasmuch as Ἀκάμαντες means “Immortals” and makes a contrast with ἔκαμε “lies dead” four lines further on. The *hiara* are shrines / rites at large and therefore those of the gods, by contrast with those of the heroes. The phrases with ἀπό “from” designate a person *coming from*—he has been in contact with—some uncanny place. These are three particular hero shrines, of Battus and *Tritopateres* and Onymastus, and then any grave at all “where a man lies dead.”⁵ To the shrines / rites (of the gods) there is access for everyone.”

“Pure” and “profane,” *hagnos* and *babalos*, are priest and lay person. This we may accept—it is commonly agreed—though it is striking that they are placed on the same footing in a religious matter. It is a question, says Dobias-Lalou, of access to shrines / rites expressed by objective genitives, and this too we may accept, though it remains to determine what *hosia* “access” implies. The rest of her interpretation seems awkward and improbable.

She finds just two objective genitives, “of *Akamantia*” in the first line and “of the *hiara*” in the last line. *Akamantia* are of course shrines / rites of heroes as a class is denied to a priest if he comes into contact with any grave at all—*except that* such access is *not denied* him if he comes into contact with any of the three hero shrines. Otherwise, access to shrines / rites of heroes as a class is unlimited. Access to

shrines / rites of the gods is unlimited, period.

The syntax here alleged is much too convoluted. *πλάν* is made to introduce all the phrases of the following two lines, an improbable construction, so as to give a series of exceptions to a rule that is only stated afterward. The ellipse postulated for the *ἀπὸ* phrases, “(coming) from (the grave of),” is very awkward, especially when the phrase must also convey the notion of polluting contact.⁶ To the shrines / rites (of the gods) there is access for everyone.” “Pure” and “profane,” *hagnos* and *babalos*, are priest and lay person. This we may accept—it is commonly agreed—though it is striking that they are placed on the same ellipse with the last *ἀπό* phrase, if *ἄλλω* means “another (place).” But the meaning is not indicated by the context,

since no place at all has been overtly mentioned; moreover, *ἔκαμε* means “died,” not “lies dead” as in a grave.⁷ Other meanings too are implausible. *Akamas* is commonly used as a personal name; how can *Akamantes* mean “Immortals”? If the rule turns on the difference between shrines / rites of the heroes and those of the gods, the respective terms should not be so particular as *Akamantia* nor so broad as “the *hiara*.”⁸

Cults of *Akamantes* and *Tritopateres*

The passage has not been placed in its proper context, which is the worship of the agrarian deities *Akamantes* and *Tritopateres*. Let us recall a few details mentioned in chapters 10 and 11.

Akamantes and *Tritopateres* are found side by side in the sacrificial calendar of the Tetrapolis of Marathon, devoted almost exclusively to agrarian deities (*SEG* 50.168 A II 32–33).⁹ Together with *Hytténios* and *Kurotrophos* they are entreated “before the *Skira*,” Demeter’s harvest festival, in the month *Skirophorion* = June. *Akamantes* are wind gods like *Tritopateres*, with a name that means “Untiring ones.” *Hytténios*, it was suggested, is named for “rain,” which is also of concern.

The deities at Marathon are all of them local ones, known to everyone in the area; *Tritopatreis* (such is the form) and *Akamantes* need not be further specified. Elsewhere, too, as in the Cerameicus at Athens, *Tritopatreis* are not further specified. But just as often such a cult is known by the name of a priestly family, added as a genitive. Boundary markers at Athens are inscribed

Τριτοπατρέων Ζακυαδῶν and *Τριτοπατρέων Εὐεργιδῶν*, an altar on Delos *Τριτοπάτωρ Πυρρακιδῶν*. The tablet at Selinus, even while instructing ordinary persons on how to sacrifice, reaffirms

the prerogative of a priestly family, as it must be, in the case of the foul *Tritopatreis*. As to *Akamantes*, Athens and Attica supply no further evidence. But wind gods in general are assigned to specialists such as the *Heudanemoi* of Athens and the *Anemokoitai* of Corinth.

This is the understanding of *Akamantes* and *Tritopateres* that we bring now to Cyrene. Wind gods are well suited to the climate of the Libyan plateau; literal “Winds” appear as the first surviving entry in the list of civic cults mentioned before (*SECir* 158 = *LS Suppl.* 116 A 2). I shall repeat my translation of the passage, then explain:

Of the rites of *Akamantes*, the use belongs to everyone both pure and profane, except (of those rites descending) from the man Battus, the founder. And of *Tritopateres* (the use so belongs except) also (of those rites descending) from Onymastus the Delphian. (Of those rites descending) from an ancestor who is different, the use does not belong to the pure. But of the shrines, the use belongs to everyone.

It will clear the way for intelligible exposition if we simply allow that the two neuter plurals occurring in the first and last lines,

Ἀκαμαντίων and *τῶν δὲ ἱερῶν*, might conceivably refer to either “shrines” or “rites.” There is in fact good reason to think that *Akamantia* and further instances are “rites” and that the *hiara* by contrast are “shrines.” Let us for the moment assume as much; it will not affect the argument.

Consider the two phrases *Ἀκαμαντίων ὁσία* (line 1), *καὶ Τριτοπατέρων* (lines 2–3). They are naturally taken as coordinate, referring to two groups of deities (indeed of wind gods), both objective genitives, so that *ὁσία* is readily understood with the latter. The meaning is “the use of the rites of *Akamantes*,” “and (the use) of *Tritopateres*”—the latter have no proprietary adjective corresponding to “*Akamantia*.” Only *ὁσία* will serve to govern *Τριτοπατέρων*: how could *ἀπό* intervene? The personal names before and after, Battus and Onomastus, are both governed by *ἀπό* twice expressed, and they too are naturally taken as coordinate—and as depending on the two groups of deities. There is still an ellipse, but it is readily supplied as “(those rites descending) from,” because of the idiom just cited: cults of *Tritopateres* are labeled with a patronymic in the genitive. *Ἀκαμαντίων ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπῳ Βάττῳ τῷ ἀρχαγέτῃ* = *Ἀκαμαντίων *Βαττιδῶν* the rites of *Akamantes* of the line of Battus. *Τριτοπατέρων ἀπὸ Ὀνυμάστῳ τῷ Δελφῷ* = *Τριτοπατέρων *Ὀνυμαστιδῶν* = *Tritopateres* of the line of Onymastus.

The hypothetical names **Battidai* and **Onymastidai* will be adopted for convenience (possibly the kinship groups were named for some intermediate ancestor, while being recognized as the lineage of

Battus and of Onymastus). The rule begins by saying that the rites of *Akamantes* are open to everyone— πλον “except” the rites belonging to the *Battidai*. There are several cults of *Akamantes*—the divine name was in common use (see below); the foremost of these belongs to a family named for Battus and deserves to be excepted. The rule continues by saying that “(the rites) of *Tritopateres* (are likewise open to everyone), καο and / even (those) of the *Onymastidai*”. There are several cults of *Tritopateres*—so there were at Athens. This time, it appears that the foremost cult is included, not excepted. Or is the meaning the same as before? Another exception is intended if we supply an ellipse: <πλὰν> καί “(except) also” those of the *Onymastidai*. Such is the translation I have adopted for general purposes, assimilating the second case to the first, as it seems possible to do. But each reader must choose for himself—the words would be ambiguous to readers at Cyrene.

The rites in question are open to everyone, priest or lay person, for the most part. In the next line rites of some kind are *not* open to a priest, which is surprising until we grasp the point. The rites are identified by another ἀπό phrase, a strange one. By analogy with the other two phrases, the object of ἀπό must be a person, not a place. It is another phrase expressing descent, ἀπὸ τοῦ δεῖνος. The object of ἀπό is the “man” we hear of next. According to a common idiom the antecedent noun is transposed to the relative clause: “from another (man), where {a man} died.” The relative clause serves to describe him as a man of long ago. The meaning of ἔκαμε is in effect “died long ago”: καμόντες and κεκμηκότες are proverbial words for the immense host of all the dead. A man who died long ago is an ancestor; the rites are those descending ἀπ’ ἄλλω “from another,” a different ancestor. That is to say, it is a different priestly family from the one to which the priest belongs.

The language is awkward because it is perverse—it expresses a perverse opinion, a derogatory view of heroic ancestors. So it was at the outset, when Battus was likewise called a “man,” emphatically, as ancestor of the family who have in charge the leading cult of *Akamantes*. Toward the end, the ancestor of another priestly family, indeed of any priestly family, is called a “man” long dead. The Greeks often said, and modern scholars have always been led to believe, that the ancestor or eponym of a priestly family, or of a very ancient and noble family, is a hero. At Cyrene some thought differently. On the east side of the agora a tomb dating from the early days of the city was a place of cult down to the fifth century, when it was destroyed and ransacked. It was replaced in the fourth century, before the time of our inscription, by a monument of a different kind, without any cult observance. Very likely this was the tomb of Battus.¹⁰

So this ἀπό phrase, like the others, defines certain rites, the rites of any priestly family other than the one to which a given priest belongs. He is denied the use of such rites. It is only reasonable. The language at the start was too effusive. Of the rites of *Akamantes* of (say) families X, Y, and Z the use now belongs to everyone, priest or lay person. Priest and lay person are put on exactly the same footing. But they need not have been. Obviously, the respective priests have always used the rites; the only innovation is for lay persons to do so; priests did not require mention. And now the mention needs to be qualified. The priest of (say) family X, and he alone, may not use the rites of families Y and Z.

After these distinctions, the last clause says simply, “But of the *hiara* the use belongs to everyone.” In the general context, either “rites” or “shrines” might be meant by *hiara*. And either might be meant by *Akamantia* and as the corresponding element of the cult of *Tritopateres*. But “rites” normally conducted by priests are a more restricted notion than “shrines” open to others as well. The *hiara* now first mentioned are the less restricted notion; they are accordingly the shrines, and the *Akamantia* and the like of *Tritopateres* are the rites. The opposite would be absurd. The rule would not first prescribe in detail who might enter the shrines and then allow everyone to conduct the rites.

The Lineage of Battus and of Onymastus

As to the kinship groups whom we have dubbed **Battidai* and **Onymastidai*, nothing is known of the latter. Yet “Onymastus the Delphian” was surely a real person, like Battus. “Onymastus” and other “Onym-” and “Onom-” names are strongly represented in Phocis, Boeotia, and south Thessaly (*LGPN* IIIB). He may well have been, without our knowing it, a considerable figure in Cyrene’s memory of its founding under Delphic auspices. If so, the family *Onymastidai* is almost as proud as the *Battidai*. Yet the cult of *Tritopateres* which they have charge of cannot be an early one. *Tritopatreis* are mostly confined to Athens and Attica, with offshoots only at Troezen, Selinus, and Cyrene; at Athens city, in the *Kerameikos*, they do not appear until the sixth century and may be a little later in Attica, later still elsewhere. Probably then the *Onymastidai* had a larger and earlier mandate than *Tritopateres* only; these were additional.

For the *Battidai* there is other evidence, though it has been overlooked. They are not of course the royal family.¹¹ Nor will they be associated with the monument of Battus in the agora. For this monument two candidates have been proposed, a circular structure at the west that was built over earlier remains in the fourth century and,

what seems more likely, a precinct at the east with a checkered history.¹² In its original form, an actual grave mound that doubtless belonged to the actual Battus, it was destroyed in the mid-fifth century, when the kingship was abolished. A different sort of monument, a chamber with gable roof, was constructed sometime in the fourth century. If Battus had any cult thereafter, a very doubtful proposition, it was surely not entrusted to a kinship group.¹³ Our *Battidai* are also to be distinguished from “*Battiadai*,” a form coined for hexameter verse—each and every Cyrenaean in sentimental mood is descended from the founder.¹⁴ Battus lent his name to different purposes, as did Erechtheus at Athens, whose progeny are now the priestly clan who serve his cult and Athena’s, now the tribe named after him, now the whole community of Athens. *Battidai* proper are a priestly clan, and their principal mandate, as it happens, is the cult of Demeter.

In an excerpt from Aelian (fr. 44 Hercher), Battus the city founder yearns indecently to know the mysteries of *Thesmophoros* and pays for it severely. This moral tale is at the same time a mocking *aition* of the office of hierophant.¹⁵ Since a hierophant consorts with women (even wearing gorgeous robes like women’s finery) and makes a great show of proclaiming Demeter’s worship, it can be imagined that the original hierophant acquired a knowledge of merely exoteric rites and was effeminated in the process. Prurient Battus, the story says, forced his way in among the women, with two consequences: priestesses revealed to him certain preliminary stages of the worship, but other women gelded him with their knives. At Gela in Sicily another priestly family (who also trace their origin to a city founder) are “hierophants of the earth deities,” i.e. the *Eumenides* as worshipped chiefly by women, and they bear the same imputation of effeminacy (Hdt. 7.153.4).¹⁶ Even the hierophants of Eleusis are suspect, though none but Hippolytus dares to say so (*Ref. omn. haer.* 5.8.40).¹⁷

The Altar of *Akamantes* Revealed?

Thus the * *Battidai* serve both Demeter and *Akamantes*.¹⁸ Demeter was as important to Cyrene as the staple crop she bestows. Her extensive sanctuary in the Wadi Bel Gadir south of the city is linked by a processional way with her sanctuary in the agora. It is a route that matches the procession of Callimachus’ *Hymn to Demeter*; Callimachus was a loyal native son. Demeter’s priesthood is fittingly entrusted to this premier descent group. *Akamantes* as wind gods exert their power at the same time as Demeter; at Marathon they are entreated just before Demeter’s harvest festival *Skira*. They too were probably brought from Athens to Cyrene and added to the original mandate of

the *Battidai*.

At Cyrene the term *Ἀκαμάντια* used in our inscription produces the further term *Ἀκαμαντιάδες (ἡμέραι)* “*Akamantias* (days),” two days in early to mid summer, ¹ *Heraios* = July and 21 *Karneios* = August (*SECir* 114b lines 34–38).¹⁹ The *Akamantia* that give their name to calendar days, let us note by the way, are surely rites, not shrines, indicating the same for the *Akamantia* of our inscription. At the earlier date, winds might be entreated on behalf of ripening figs; at the later, on behalf of grapes.²⁰ The two dates do not correspond to any particular observances in Attic calendars; grapes are not a usual Attic crop; if *Akamantes* originate at Athens, they are now adapted to Cyrene.

A recent discovery may give us the shrine of *Akamantes* served by the clan * *Battidai*. Demeter’s sanctuary in the agora consists of an early *temenos* on the west side and perhaps the circular structure otherwise assigned to Battus. Between them another circular monument has now come to light—it had been shaved off and concealed by the Roman pavement.²¹ First constructed at the end of the sixth century, as the *temenos* entered its second phase, and still in use when Demeter’s circular structure was built nearby, it is a massive hollow circular altar enclosed and hidden by a circular peribolos wall. Being so close, the altar is somehow allied with the cult of Demeter.²² Two votive *skyphoi* in the altar debris give a clue, it is only that, to the deity or deities concerned. The one is inscribed *Ἄνακτος* “of my Lord,” the other “Euremon dedicated [this] to his Lord,” *τῷ Ἄνακτι*. This need not be the sole name or title.²³ It is equally appropriate to a single member of the collective *Akamantes*.

The construction of the altar suits *Akamantes* as wind gods. The hollow interior is plainly meant to catch the offerings. Wind gods are quite generally worshipped at *bothroi*.²⁴ The altar at Cyrene has an extra feature that seems to be unique. The curving blocks of the altar wall are not flush together: they are set a few centimeters apart.²⁵ Solid matter would be caught within, but any puddle of liquid would drain off or evaporate. At Selinus, we recall, the burnt offerings that went into the chamber or pit of the *Tritopatres* were consolidated by sprinkling and smearing (chapter 10, pp. 162–64).

Hosia “Lawful Use”

This rule is brief, just five lines, but has a large effect, granting to everyone the *hosia* “lawful use” of rites and shrines of *Akamantes* and *Tritopatres*, agrarian deities of wide renown at Cyrene. There is at least one exception, the cult of *Akamantes*, belonging to the priestly family *Battidai*; the cult of *Tritopatres*, belonging to the priestly family

Onymastidai, is an exception too, unless it is singled out instead as subject to the rule. Yet the two exceptions, or the exception and the inclusion, only emphasize how important all these cults are, how much is granted otherwise. “Everyone” is glossed effusively as “both pure and profane,” i.e. both priest and lay person. But of course the innovation consists in granting use to lay persons. As an amusing consequence of the effusive language, it must be expressly said that each priestly family is still restricted to the cult that is their own.

It is often assumed that *hosia* is mere “access.” Why should mere access ever be denied to any adult citizen (unless a debtor or a felon), and why should it now be asserted equally for priests and lay persons? It has been assumed as well that the rule is stated only for the sake of exceptions that arise from polluting contact with certain places. The sequence of thought is all but impossible. Such a rule would be stated as a prohibition: “of certain rites, *hosia* does not belong to” whomever it may be. And the syntax has been misunderstood: the $\alpha\pi\theta$ phrases do not denote polluting contact, and there is not a continuous series of such phrases. And the deities and the persons named have all been misconceived; they do not belong to graves and hero cults that somehow pollute.

The emphasis is plain. Everyman is now his own priest; everyman now conducts a sacrifice for himself. It is the same leveling dispensation as at Selinus, where everyman was encouraged to sacrifice privately to *Tritopatreis* and to Zeus *milichios*. There the purpose was benevolent, and full instructions were given on how to manage the sacrifice correctly and economically. But the language was the same where it was needed. Sacrifice to the foul *Tritopatreis*, or at least the disposition of the burnt portion that belongs to these uncanny powers, is still reserved for the priestly family—*οἷς ὁσία* “those who have the right” or “the use.”

At Cyrene the rule is peremptory, and no instructions are given. The following six-line section deals with the inevitable result.

A Bungled Sacrifice

It will again be useful to repeat the translation.

If one sacrifices on the altar a victim that it is not the custom to sacrifice, take away the thickened residue from the altar and wash it off, and remove the other soilure from the shrine and the ash from the altar, and take away the fire to a pure place. And then after washing oneself, after purifying the shrine and sacrificing as a penalty a fullgrown animal, then one shall sacrifice as the custom is.

The last line ends with the words *ὥς νομῖ*; there is room for

nothing more. Dobias-Lalou and some before her suppose that this line runs into the next, *οκώχμιος μέστα ἐς ἀδελφῶν τέκνα*. A word is thus divided between the lines; it is a *hapax*, and its meaning must be guessed at; likewise the meaning of the whole clause, about something devolving “as far as brothers’ children.” With whatever guesses, the clause so constituted still has no discernible connection with the gritty details of the preceding lines.

There are further objections. This next line is signaled by a *paragraphos*, and after it another *paragraphos* signals the first section of the tithing rules. The single line is readily understood as a heading for the tithing rules, where responsibility may indeed devolve from one generation to the next.²⁶ On the other hand, to sacrifice *ὡς νόμ(ος)* is just the right conclusion to a remedy for sacrificing contrary to *νόμος*.

In any case—whether we make it six lines or seven—the section is always regarded as a separate entry, unconnected with what precedes, “the lawful use” by everyman of certain rites and shrines, or with what follows, the tithing rules. These are both substantial matters, though one is very brief and the other is the longest section of all. The cleansing of just any altar is not a rule to be inserted between them. Instead, the cleansing of an altar seems a fitting supplement to the section before, “the lawful use” by everyman of certain rites and shrines. What if everyman sacrifices the wrong animal?

Sacrificial ash accumulates at any altar and is meant to do so (chapter 10, p. 163). But not if it is the wrong animal. Every trace must be obliterated. The first step is to “take away the thickened residue from the altar and wash [the altar] off.” It is not loose ash and charred bone to be swept up but a pasty or clotted mass called *ποτι-πίαμ-μα* “additional-thicken-ing” or “thickened residue.”²⁷ The altar also needs to be scrubbed. It seems that the ash has both solidified and adhered to the surface. Is it not the result of the operation described at Selinus for the chamber of *Tritopatreis*, and implied at Cyrene by the construction of the altar in the agora, which is arguably the leading instance of the cult of *Akamantes*? At Selinus, “they shall sprinkle round and smear over.” At Cyrene, any puddle of liquid is meant to drain off, leaving only the solid matter. Afterwards, such an altar is difficult to clean, though it must now be done.

The next steps involve “the rest of the soilure” and “the ash from the altar” and “the (altar) fire.” “The rest of the soilure” might be other remnants of the wrong victim, such as blood or bones produced by the butchering (they would be disposed of anyway, but perhaps not so completely as now required). “The ash from the altar” can only be the aforesaid residue.²⁸ So these two elements should be taken together as objects of “remove from the shrine.” “Take away the fire

to a pure place” stands by itself; to do the same with the ash would be perverse. The fire needs to be set aside while one washes oneself and purifies the shrine.²⁹ So these two elements should be taken together as objects of “remove from the shrine” is somehow a self-evident procedure, often mentioned in the tithing rules; it might be to slaughter a piglet and sprinkle its blood. A full-grown animal is sacrificed as a penalty. Finally, the original sacrifice is performed with the proper victim.

The rule for making amends is punctilious. It is the consequence of an important change, granting everyman the use of the rites and shrines of *Akamantes* and *Tritopateres*.

1. Parker (1983, 336–39). More recently, Brunel (1984), Pugliese Carratelli (1987), Dobias-Lalou (1996).

2. My purpose is to convey her meaning with respect to the difficulties. So I do not exactly reproduce either of her own translations (1996, 77, which is more a paraphrase, and 2000, 304). The translation of Rhodes and Osborne, GHI 97, avowedly, but not entirely, follows Brunel (1984).

3. The reading *Ἀκαμαντίων* is assured (chapter 17, p. 269). Maas, in suggesting the name, pointed to the calendar of Marathon, adduced below.

4. *τῶ {τω}* seems to be a dittography. Or rather, *(Βατ)τω τω τω* makes it a tritography.

5. It is usual to take these three names as coordinate. In comment on Selinus’ tablet, JJK (110–11) and Rausch (2000b, 114–15) say that Tritopateres as ancestral spirits are like Battus and Onymastus as founding heroes. But at Cyrene the Tritopateres differ from ancestral spirits (or from Battus and Onymastus) both as a group of undoubted deities, like Akamantes, and by way of syntax, since the genitive is not governed by *ἀπό*.

6. This notion is, however, common to most interpretations: see Parker (1983, 338).

7. Others who think of a tomb speak rather of “a brachylogy” (Parker 1983, 338). It is a brachylogy several times compounded: “(coming) from another (place) where the man (was buried after he) died.”

8. The various explanations of *Akamantia* vs. *hiara* surveyed by Parker (1983, 337–38) are not more convincing.

9. The observance belongs to the annual cycle of the deme of Marathon. “Since the offerings are presented in chronological order, the juxtaposition of *Tritopatreis* and *Akamantes* is no proof of a connection,” says Latte (1928, 43), seconded by Parker (1983, 337). What connection can be closer than between deities worshipped on the same day in a small agricultural community? 1 See note 13.

10. See note 13.

11. No doubt the royal family once had ritual duties. Demonax, while transferring power to the people, “set aside domains and priesthoods” for the king (Hdt. 4.161.3). Domains, *temene*, were always a royal attribute, as in the Mycenaean tablets and in Homer, and perhaps they were now to meet the expense of the king’s ritual duties, as suggested by Carlier (1984, 475n696). Chamoux (1988, 148) holds that the king served as priest of Apollo until the eponymous priesthood was created at the abolition of the kingship and that Apollo’s domains—those in question, he believes—were then separated from the priesthood to be administered by the board

of *damiergoi*. However this may be, the royal family assuredly did not keep its honors down to the late fourth century. And on general grounds, it is likely that the priestly families of Cyrene existed from an early date, beside the kingship.

12. The circular monument was for long the favorite and bulks large in comment on our inscription. It is upheld again by Laronde (1987, 171–75), but his arguments do not seem sufficient. The precinct on the east was published and so identified by Stucchi (1965, 58–65, 110–14, '39–42); cf. Bacchielli (1990, 1996), *Cirene* 61–64 (S. Ensoli). Malkin (1987, 206–10, 216) thinks of the precinct as “an oracle of Battus” for no reason but that he adopts the discredited reading $\alpha < i > \kappa \alpha \mu \alpha \nu \tau \varsigma \omega \nu$ in line 21.

13. Under the heading “the traces of cult” Gasperini (1997, 2–10) canvasses mentions of Battus in literature and inscriptions, including ours, but in fact none of them points to cult.

14. Callim. *H. Apoll.* 96, *Epigr.* 35.1, whence other instances in Latin verse, also *SECir* 80.2. This fragmentary epigram, second century B.c. according to the letter forms, mentions $\alpha \tau \tau \alpha$ [, perhaps dative plural. Apollo is invoked, and the stone is thought to come from his shrine in the agora, but there is hardly room or occasion for the story of how he guided Battus, as proposed by Gasperini (1997, 9–10).

15. It is usually thought that the gelding of Battus as condign punishment is the sole point of the story: so e.g. Parker (1983, 179). But it is just as significant that the authoritative priestesses first impart certain elements of the ritual.

16. “[The archetypal hierophant *Telines*] is said by the inhabitants of Sicily to have been the opposite [of a brave man], a womanish and rather soft person.” Cf. chapter 6, p. 92.

17. The high voice with which they address initiates is acquired by drinking hemlock, with sterilizing effect.

18. At Athens the *Phytalidai* serve both Demeter and Zeus *milichios* (chapter 13), and for the very reason that will apply at Cyrene: both deities exert their power at the same time, in late *SkirophoriOn* = June and early *Hekatombaion* = July.

19. *Ἀκαμαντιάδες / [Ἡ]ραίων / [πρ]άτα φθίνοντος / [Καρν]ηίων / δεκάς*, the improved reading of Dobias-Lalou (1996, 75); cf. Brunel (1984), Pugliese Carratelli (1987). *Heraios* and *Karneios* are successive summer months at Byzantium, the only place where the calendar in question is preserved entire. They will be so in the calendar of the mother city Megara and probably in that of Corinth as well: Trümper (1997, 147–64). The evidence at Cyrene is better now than appears from Trümper (186–87). Dorian *Karneios* = Athenian *Meta-geitnion*, says Plutarch, as a general rule. Trümper is wrong to prefer *Boedromion*: chapter 13, n. 14.

20. Both are important crops in the accounts of the *damiergoi*.

21. It is published and reconstructed by Santucci (1998), from whom I take the following details, except for the identification. She summarizes at *Cirene* 82–83.

22. Santucci further notes that the altar and Demeter's sanctuary were both, repeatedly and at just the same time, kept in trim with the rising ground level.

23. Santucci (1998, 530–35) argues that Aristaeus is meant, as a divine counterpart of the hero Battus on the opposite side of the agora. It is true that the debris includes characteristic figurines of local nymphs, and that nymphs go with Aristaeus—but nymphs go equally with other minor agrarian deities, including *Tritopator* on Delos. (Santucci also, while discounting it, speaks of *anax* or *anakes* as a supposed title of *Tritopatreus* or *Tritopatreis* at Athens, but this was only a false inference from Cic. *De nat. deor.* 3.21, 53 by Hemberg [1955, 15, 1 35–36].) According to Dobias-Lalou (1999), “some unpublished documents show that Castor alone is later the object of a cult in the region under the name of *Ova*,” but the

significance of this remains to be seen.

24. See chapter ii apropos of the sunken chamber referred to in Selinus' tablet. The altar at Cyrene is on a larger scale. A circular monument at Athens, right next to the *Eleusinion* on the Acropolis shoulder, is larger still, a full 8 m. in diameter: Miles (1998a, 13–15, 81–83). Perhaps it is the altar of the *Heudanemoi*, or else evokes it. Arrian, in a passage generally misunderstood (*Anab.* 3.16.8), distorted also by misunderstanding of Pausanias (1.8.5), situates the altar of the *Heudanemoi* just here, beside the Acropolis ascent and in an open area, yet among the secrets as it were of Eleusinian initiates. The same area has yielded five sculpted rectangular altars, on average half a meter on a side, apparently either a decorative or a votive motif. The circular monument is thought of as a roofed building, but there is little trace of any superstructure above a seeming socle, and none whatever of a roof, only the remnant of a base in the middle. Instead, we might think of another decorative motif, with a stele or other fixture on the base. This area adjoining the *Eleusinion*, like the *Eleusinion* itself, extends beyond the Agora concession into unexcavated ground at the east.

25. Santucci (1998, 526–27). Though only the lowest course is preserved, incised guidelines show that the feature continued above: the contents of the altar would continually rise. Santucci thinks of “a partial, progressive emptying of the ashes,” but this would not occur after they solidified, and of course the ashes are meant to stay.

26. So rightly Parker (1983, 339) and Rhodes and Osborne, *GHI*97. Rhodes and Osborne in their text show three successive *paragraphoi*, at lines 31, 32, and 33, without explanation.

27. It is the *nomen acti* of **προσπιαίνω*. The usual interpretation is “the residue of fat” that adheres to the altar (so Wilamowitz [1927, 160], and now Dobias-Lalou [2000, 207, 305]), otherwise “the coating of fat” that makes the god’s portion more flammable (so Latte [1928, 44]). The first renders *πρσ-* correctly, but in neither case does the “fat” of the animal remain after the offering is burnt.

28. *ἰκνυν*: cf. Hsch. *ἰκνυνον· κονίαν, σμήμα*, Hippocr. *Nat. mul.* 88, “after dissolving *ἰγνυν* in wine” (so Wilamowitz).

29. Nothing is said of renewing the fire, as from an external source, which would require a special ceremony.

The Tithing Rules

Synopsis

The tithing rules are the longest section of the inscription and the most carefully constructed. All the members of a so-called tithed class, together with the property in question, are identified in due order, down to the third generation, and in each case they are required (1) to undertake a thorough purification of person and property and Apollo's shrine, (2) to calculate a literal tenth of the property, (3) to pay the value in sacrificial animals, (4) to slaughter the animals in Apollo's sanctuary and collect the meat. The very language is as strict and repetitive as the procedure, and the different kinds of person and property are neatly dealt with in five symmetrical subsections often lines each. It is a feat of composition, with details slightly abridged from time to time. Furthermore, the rest of the inscription is intended to complement the tithing rules. The long section that follows is related. These two sections in the middle are framed by a variety of rules before and after, which are of equal length on either side.

The tithed class is not invented for the present purpose; an old custom has been revived. Customary phrases can be recognized. One of them is used for the culminating act, the slaughter of animals for the sake of the meat. It is echoed in a large number of rock-cut inscriptions at Lindus. The site here is not a sanctuary but an extensive plateau beside the sea that served, without altars or other improvement, for slaughtering animals according to the rites of several deities who otherwise preside over community gatherings. Chief among them, never named but unmistakably revealed by one of the ritual terms, is Apollo. Apollo's ritual is often adorned with aetiological stories about Heracles and other figures who are virtual outcasts, denied a share at a community feast. Outcasts are also featured in stories of the Delphic oracle, and groups of them may be described as a tithe, i.e. a tithed class. In such stories the Delphic oracle stands for the general practice of local cults.

The outcasts are lacking in legitimate descent; they are typically bastards. At a later date they become citizens of a lesser kind, with the distinction persisting often to the third generation. Such are the tithed class at Cyrene. Now treated with archaic severity, they provide a large quantity of meat for general consumption. They will resent it, but many other people will be pleased.

Tithing as the Centerpiece of the Inscription

The next section is the longest, comprising five subsections of equal length, ten lines each, about a certain class of persons and property known as the “tithed,” i.e. “tentthed,” *δεκατοί* and *δεκατά* (lines 33–82). The ten-line format has been suited to the name, not without some difficulty. Tithed persons in different cases are required to undergo a costly procedure of purification and sacrifice in Apollo’s sanctuary. The tithing section is set off by its own heading (line 32). And it is followed by a section, less evenly divided into four subsections, about women who must undergo a procedure of purification and sacrifice at the shrine of Artemis, which happens to be part of Apollo’s sanctuary (lines 83–109).

The content of these two long sections is more uniform than the rest of the inscription. The material that precedes, i.e. lines 1–31, is diverse, and so is the material that follows, i.e. lines 110–41. What precedes is the general rules and those for *Akamantes* and *Tritopateres*. What follows is three forms of purifying ritual that are quite unlike each other, even though they ostensibly belong to the same *hikesios* category. Yet these two bodies of disparate material, preceding and following, are nicely balanced at 31 and 32 lines apiece, as if they were assembled for the purpose of flanking the two sections at the center. The sections at the center also display a striking uniformity of language, in contrast to the variable language elsewhere. The oft-repeated rules for purifying and sacrificing, with a standard vocabulary and syntax, have a legalistic precision.

Now the tithing section imposes a costly procedure that has great practical importance. The section on women does not. And its uniformity is flawed, since the last of four subsections is not about the ritual of Artemis but about miscarriage, which belongs rather with the general rules. So this section too is only accessory to the tithing section. The conclusion is inescapable. For the authorities at Cyrene the tithing obligation was a principal concern. All the other rules were made to serve as a framing device.

Almost the whole procedure takes place at the “shrine,” *hiaron*—which by good fortune is further specified as “Apollo’s shrine,” *Apollonion* (lines 51, 59, 66). The proper name may, in a given

context, denote any shrine of Apollo, including Cyrene's foremost sanctuary, where the inscription stands. It is true that Apollo has another shrine of general importance, at the southwest corner of the agora. And it is true again that a tithed person is assessed for his worth "by being sold in the agora"—the phrase denotes some former practice that has become a pretense (lines 34–35, 69). Yet the agora is not a likely setting for the rest of the procedure. It calls for the sacrifice of several animals or even many animals and then for the removal of something, which must be the meat, "to a pure place." Only the great sanctuary at the northwest offers the necessary space and facilities. It may be added that the rites of Artemis in the following section are undoubtedly performed in the great sanctuary, and the part of it reserved for Artemis is likewise purified before a sacrifice and likewise referred to as either the *hiaron* or the *Artamition*.

Who and what are the "tithed," to be thus treated in Apollo's sanctuary? Like other deities, Apollo often receives a thank-offering of a *δεκάτα* "tithe" in a figurative sense, at Cyrene as elsewhere, but there is nothing in this practice that seems relevant to a tithed class of persons and property.¹ A more promising analogy is offered by certain traditional stories about groups of persons in early days who are regarded as a "tithe" and are sent forth by the Delphic oracle.² Sometimes they are sent abroad. The Delphic oracle is famous for directing settlers to new lands, to Cyrene as to other colonial cities, though not as a "tithe." However these matters consort, the tithing of our inscription may go back to old custom.

It is now rigorously enforced. If it applies to newcomers, these can only be new citizens in process of assimilation. The tithing rules are headed by the phrase "(one) bound as far as brothers' children," which means that the tithing obligation is inherited for two generations. It would not be surprising if newcomers were under obligation for just so long.

Despite the insistent repetitious language, the tithing section has been found as difficult as any part of the inscription. A careful reading is required, without presuppositions but also without forgetting circumstances in Cyrene. The five subsections are separate occasions when the costly procedure, or most of it, is required. We shall take the procedure first, then the occasions. And first of all, we must consider the matter of purification with which the procedure begins.

Purification

In each case a tithed person purifies himself "with blood," then purifies the shrine (lines 33–34, 40–41, 41–42, 68–71). The tithed property is also purified, and then the shrine, but "separately"—the

property of course lies elsewhere, consisting we may suppose of land, crops, and animals (lines 43–44, 50–51, 58–59, 65–66). To judge from the expression “with blood,” the purifying action is to slaughter a piglet and sprinkle its blood.³ Unlike the sacrifice of animals, the purifying action has no practical value; so it is not more closely regulated. But the insistence on all the same actions each time is remarkable. We can hardly suppose that purification is a mere formality, as it is on some occasions.⁴ It must be essential to the tithing obligation. Person, property, and shrine are polluted—or at least potentially polluted, since pollution is unseen and incalculable.

We ask therefore whether the tithing obligation has just arisen from some pollution, or whether pollution is inherent in the tithing obligation.⁵ A polluting act is indeed expressly mentioned, that of an adolescent who may pollute himself either involuntarily or voluntarily (lines 40–42). As we shall see, it is the prurient mischief that an adolescent will get into in the company of lusty men, as at the sanctuary of Apollo. It is mentioned by the way, in the manner of the minor rules about intercourse and other bodily pollutions; indeed the same language about polluting oneself involuntarily or voluntarily is used hereafter of a bride just before marriage. The mischief is accordingly irrelevant to the tithed class as such. Since no other source of pollution is envisaged, the general pollution is inherent: to be tithed is also to be polluted.⁶

Pollution threatens in many forms, to be countered by various deities. Apollo is chiefly concerned with sickness and plague.⁷ Sickness and plague are often brought by newcomers, especially those from far off or from a different way of life. Greeks of Cyrene intermarried with Libyans. Though Libyans were reputedly the healthiest people in the world (Hdt. 2.77.3, 4.187.3), precautions were in order. It was said of the great plague in the later fifth century that it began in Ethiopia and spread first to Egypt and Libya (Thuc. 2.48.1).

The Sacrificial Procedure

It is the sacrificial procedure that occupies most of each section. Everyone sacrifices “as a penalty an animal full grown,” even lesser offenders like a mere lad or one who has drawn on property illicitly so as to make funerary offerings (lines 36–37, 42, 44–45, 51–52, 59–61, 66–67, 69–70). This is only a preliminary sacrifice, “before the tithe.” To “sacrifice the tithe” obviously means to sacrifice animals valued at this sum (lines 37–38, 46, 61, 67–68, 70–71). And that full-grown animal does not even count. In each case, the value of the tithe is carefully established—whereas a person is “sold in the agora,” one “assesses”

either property or a deceased person (lines 43–44, 57–58, 64–65). Whatever was done, it is a means of determining the tithe, the literal tenth, exactly. Before this, we may suppose, the tithe was something less than a tenth or was a mere token, and perhaps it was only voluntary.

We should compare the property rating in the draft constitution, *diagramma*, which Ptolemy issued for Cyrene probably in 321 B.C. (SEG 9.1 lines 7–11). The select body of citizens called the Ten Thousand will possess twenty minas = 2,000 drachmas. The tithe on this, 200 drachmas, would purchase from sixteen to twenty ewes at the Athenian price of 12 or 10 drachmas, but at Cyrene the price of grazing animals would be much lower, and the number of ewes much higher. The general body of citizens will possess less than 2,000 drachmas. Yet all who are tithed must furnish a full-grown animal as a penalty, even before the tithe. A great many animals are in question.

The two sacrifices, the penalty and the tithe, are followed each time by the clause ἀποισεῖ ἐς καθαρὸν “he shall carry away to a pure place.” Following on both sacrifices, the clause probably applies to both.⁸ Sickness and plague are often brought by newcomers, especially those from far off or from a different way of life. Greeks of Cyrene intermarried with Libyans. Though Libyans were reputedly the healthiest people in the world (Hdt. 2.77.3, 4.187.3), precautions were in order. It was said of the great plague in the later fifth century that it began in Ethiopia and spread first to Egypt and Libya (Thuc. 2.48.1).

The Sacrificial Procedure

It is the meat thus obtained; “the pure place” is some area where the meat can be collected in the interim, just as the altar fire is kept apart in the interim (line 29). The injunction is a notable departure from the usual requirement of Greek sacrifice, namely that the whole animal be consumed straightway in the sanctuary.⁹ We sometimes find the requirement expressed, if it seems necessary, as an injunction with δαίνυσθαι, θοινᾶσθαι, ἀναλίσκειν, καταχρῆσθαι or again with κατακόπτειν, σκηνέειν as an attendant act. But it occurs much more commonly as the simplest of prohibitions: οὐ φορά / οὐκ ἀποφορά / οὐκ ἐκφορά “there is no carrying (away).”¹⁰ This is an age-old customary rule, which goes to show that the act of sacrifice consecrates the animal to the god: disposing of the meat in any other way than to please him is a secondary practice. Very rarely the prohibition is reversed as a special permission for someone to carry away something, e.g. ἀποφορά for a priest of a

leg.¹¹ Now the oft-repeated clause of our inscription reverses the prohibition in the same direct way, with the verb ἀποισεῖ. It too may well represent an old custom.

After the first instance of carrying away by a grown man who is tithed, it is further said, “everyone who sacrifices shall bring a σκοῦκιον” (line 39). This and the similar words κοῦκιον, κοῦκας, and the words κοῖξ, κοῖς otherwise denoting a kind of Egyptian palm, are all used in the papyri of a basket that sometimes serves to contain loaves of bread.¹² And κοῖς is similarly used by Epicharmus (fr. 112 K-A), and κοῖξ by Pherecrates (fr. 83 K-A) and Antiphanes (fr. 64 K-A). And both Pollux, who cites them, and Hesychius describe the basket as a woven one. “Basket” then is another meaning of the very word for the palm; as often, the apparent diminutives σκοῦκιον, κοῦκιον are only colloquial forms without any diminutive meaning. Since Epicharmus and our inscription provide much the earliest instances of the words so used, we infer that the Egyptian article became familiar in Sicily and at Cyrene much earlier than elsewhere. The etymology of the word, presumably Egyptian, is unknown.¹³ Very likely the form σκοῦκιον—occurring only at Cyrene and in three Hellenistic papyri, earlier than the rest—is original, with initial σ disappearing thereafter, as often in Greek.¹⁴

A basket woven of palm leaves will be strong and capacious.¹⁵ “Everyone who sacrifices” needs it to carry something. This can only be the meat produced by the sacrifice, which is always carried away to a pure place. Though mentioned only on the first occasion, the basket is obviously needed for each occasion thereafter. Unlike the sacrifice and unlike the carrying away, which is all important, this practical detail is too obvious to be repeated. Given the ten-line format, space is at a premium.

Another detail that is appropriate throughout is not mentioned until a subsequent occasion but faithfully thereafter. This unequal pattern is plainly due to the constraint of ten-line sections. Each sacrifice, first of a full-grown animal and then of the tithe, is to be conducted προβῶμιον “in front of the altar” (61 bis, 67, 68, 77). The predicate adjective is attached to the sacrificial animal or else to the “penalty” or the “tithe,” both consisting of sacrificial animals. “In front of the altar” sounds almost like a decency suited to the present context. If one is intent on the butchering, on simply producing the requisite meat, one might otherwise resort to any convenient place away from the altar. But a decency would not be so expressed; προβῶμιος is a customary word for a customary practice. The practice has always existed of slaughtering animals on a large scale for the sake of the meat and of professing that it is a sacrifice truly meant, “in front of the altar.” Both προβῶμιος and the synonym

προσχάρατος “in front of the *eschara*” occur in other inscriptions at other sites where animals seem to have been slaughtered in large numbers. This important clue will be pursued below.

The Several Occasions

The first section deals with a tithed person, the second with tithed property, the third and fourth with the death of a tithed person and the consequence for his property. It is only natural to infer that a tithed person is assessed for what he owns, as by the old custom of bidding in the agora, so that a tithed property always belongs to a tithed person. It is clear in any case from the fourth section that a tithed person is the hereditary owner of certain property, now transmitted to an heir. But the second section about tithed property alone has led to the curious belief that such property exists as a class apart from tithed persons.¹⁶ The belief is unwarranted. We need only assume that the property in question is here conveyed for the first time to a person who will be tithed or is already.

Let us take the sections in order to see if it is not so. In the first section “a grown man,” *hēbatas*, must undertake the procedure, but we are not told when. It might be at a customary time, say the harvest, or it might be at any time in the year. Only a grown man is so obliged, a property owner it must be. Whereas the following sections each occupy ten lines as a tithing rule should, this one runs to seven lines only. The balance is made up by a short rule about an adolescent, *epēbos* (a Doric form of *ephēbos*), obviously one who belongs to a tithed family.¹⁷ “If he pollutes himself involuntarily” or again “voluntarily,” a penalty is imposed, and in the latter case it rises to the sacrifice of a fullgrown animal. The authorities have found a way to extend the levy even to a minor, but what is it?

A bride is similarly dealt with in the first section prescribing rites of Artemis. She must not pollute herself by lying with her husband prematurely, but if she does, the penalty depends on whether she pollutes herself voluntarily or involuntarily (lines 83–90). It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the lad has yielded to a man of the usual Dorian inclination.¹⁸ He is no doubt exposed to improper advances when lads and men both gather at Apollo’s sanctuary.

For this the penalty of sacrificing a full-grown animal seems harsh. The same penalty in the same language is part of the obligation of the tithed class, repeated in each section, including the first about “a grown man.” But now it falls on any lad who misbehaves. It may be that the class is disliked, though this is not a necessary inference.

The next section is the one about tithed property. Who it is that undertakes the procedure is not stated; it is somehow self-evident. He

must do it before he makes any funerary offering whatever; if he makes such an offering, there is a further penalty of a full-grown animal. Why is he so tempted to make a funeral offering? Surely he has inherited the property from the deceased. But if this is also the moment when the property first becomes tithed, it has passed from an ordinary citizen to the tithed kind. How such a thing might happen depends on the laws of property at Cyrene, which are unknown to us. Perhaps the deceased bequeathed his property or a part of it to a nephew who is tithed. Perhaps he bequeathed it to a son born of an irregular union, if such offspring also belong to the tithed class.¹⁹ He is no doubt exposed to improper advances when lads and men both gather at Apollo's sanctuary.

Next we hear of a tithed person who dies and receives a funerary offering at burial—but may receive nothing more until the tithe is paid on the property. The person who makes the permitted offering can only be the heir.²⁰ He is assessed for the worth of the property and carries out the procedure. The tithed kind of citizen continues from one generation to the next.

And next again we hear of a tithed person who dies, but now with young children, of whom some may be deceased and some living. It is evident that none is of an age to inherit the property straightway. An interim procedure is imposed, which is even more costly. Those who are deceased—and the death of children was a common occurrence—are assessed for the most they are worth, and the procedure is carried out on their behalf. Then “the living (one),” i.e. the child who will in fact inherit, is assessed likewise and carries out the procedure on his own behalf. Why this twofold procedure? The deceased children must be sons who each of them were designated, or even begotten, one after the other, as sole heir. So the case first envisaged is of a designated heir who died before the living one succeeded him, or of more than one such heir. The procedure ensues as if the property had been transmitted after death. If more than one such heir has died, is the procedure required for each? That would be logical, and the language is conformable. The language could have been more explicit, but perhaps not within the prescribed ten lines.

We come to the last section, at the bottom of the column. The bottom is damaged, and only the first five lines can be substantially made out. The remnants here, consisting of two or more recognizable clauses in each line, were examined in detail in chapter 17. The syntax is evident throughout. There are four sentences in all, with just a few operative words to be supplied. This we shall now do in the light of the preceding sections.

At the outset, at the beginning of line 73, there is a qualifying adjective that describes the person in question, just like *ἡβητάς*

“grown (man)” and [ἐ]πῆβος “adolescent” in lines 33 and 40 of the first section. The separate phrase with ἐὼν indicates that the person continues with us from the previous section, where the deceased left his property to a son not yet of age. That occasion called for an interim procedure, a costly one. When the son comes of age, when he is “grown,” what then? It is a question also posed by the first section, which dealt with the case of any tithed person as we find him today, a “grown” man who may likewise have a son, an “adolescent” son. If nothing more were said, we would assume that a “grown” son must undergo the full procedure as soon as he inherits the property. But the language of this section, unlike the rest, is mild and forbearing: the person in question will be spared to a degree. And this is understandable in the case of an heir who has just come of age, in virtue of the procedures already imposed either on the living father or at the death of one without a grown son. The context prompts us to restore ἡβατὰς ἐὼν “being a grown man.”

Since the procedure always begins with the assessment, it is only natural to restore [ἐπεὶ / κα ἐκτιμα]θήνι “after he is assessed” (lines 73–74). It is said next, “he shall sacrifice whenever he wishes,” quite plainly a relaxation of the punctual observance thus far required. He may do so at any time of year. And whereas one always purifies Apollo’s shrine before sacrificing, there is a further relaxation, probably to be completed as [ὥς / δέ κα καθάρ]ηι, καθαρμός ἀποχρεῖ ὅπ[όκα] τις [θύσει] “when he has (once) purified, the purification suffices whenever one sacrifices” (lines 74–75). And yet another relaxation, probably καὶ αὐτὸν καθᾶραι οὐ δεῖ “and oneself it is not necessary to purify” (line 76). Hitherto, after one purifies oneself, and the property, and the shrine, the next step is to sacrifice a full-grown animal as a penalty and of course to carry away the meat to a pure place, for the use of others. Now there is a quite substantial improvement.

αἱ δέ κα δήληται, [θύσας / βότον τέλευν] προβώμιον, οἷσεῖ ὅπ[υι κα δήληται] “if he wishes, after sacrificing a full-grown animal in front of the altar, he shall carry it away wherever he wishes” (lines 76–77). It is not clear whether the sacrifice itself is optional. But if he does sacrifice, he keeps the meat for himself.

The rest is lost, another five lines (78–82). The final step in the procedure five times repeated is always to “sacrifice the tithe.” This, the real burden, must have been lightened too, but not so as to occupy five lines. There was more, and we can guess what it was. The previous sections have dealt with a tithed person as we find him today and with property newly tithed and with transmission to an heir. The last section deals first with the heir, the second generation, and we find that the liability is relaxed. What comes next? The tithing rules have a general heading, “(one) bound as far as brothers’ children”

(line 32). That is, a tithed person is liable thus far—the liability passes to sons and nephews but no further. In the next generation, a grandson or greatnephew becomes an ordinary citizen who is not tithed. This was doubtless indicated in the last line or two.

The tithing rules take much for granted, the traditional status of the tithed and the customary procedure. Comparative material is needed, and it does exist. First the procedure.

“Sacrifice in Front of the Altar”

Each animal, whether named as such or as “tithe” or “penalty,” is to be sacrificed *προβώμιον* “in front of the altar.” Since any sacrifice is so conducted, the expression affirms that this slaughter of animals is indeed a sacrifice. Much earlier, the word occurs in Euripides and perhaps in Pindar. Of course they do not use it with the same intent. In *Heraclidae*, line 79, the unaccustomed neuter plural *προβώμια* is a concise and vivid way to designate the area where suppliants huddle. In *Ion*, lines 376–77, the expression *προβωμίσιςφαγαῖς μήλων* locates the slaughter of animals “in front of the altar” because it is just here that organs and other parts are extracted and used for divination.²¹ He is a secondary use; the procedure at Cyrene leaves no room for divination. But *Ion* as the speaker is servant of the Delphic Apollo. In Pindar, *Paean* 7 line 15, the word is perhaps to be restored in a context of sacrificing bulls to the oracular Apollo at Thebes or the Ptoion ([*ν* *προβωμ*]). We begin to suspect that Apollo is especially concerned with “sacrifice in front of the altar.”

Elsewhere at Cyrene, at the rural site of Ain Hofra east of the city, the term *προβώμιος* occurs in another rock-cut inscription. This extensive rural area was described in chapter 6, together with the many rock-cut inscriptions, s. V-IV, attesting the worship of *Eumenides* and other deities of under-earth (above pp. 93–95). The longest inscription of all, running to seven lines, is quite different (*SEG* 9.345, s. IV). The first line is a heading, *ἄδε προβώμιος* [- -]. An obvious supplement, though it has not been proposed, is *θυσία*. A synonymous phrase, *προσχάριος θυσία* *οἱ θυσία προσχάριος*, is used often in the rock-cut inscriptions of Lindus discussed below; *θυσεῖ . . . προβώμιον* is the formula of our inscription. Very little is legible thereafter. The second line, [- -] *σιος* [- -], might contain another nominative phrase or a name in the genitive, in either case perhaps part of the heading.²² The third line says simply *τὸ ἄντρον* “the cave,” and the fourth is illegible. Lines 5–7 each begin with *καί* and might consist of a series of divine names, with “Apollo” as a possible restoration.²³ These very tenuous suggestions would assimilate the inscription of Ain Hofra to our next instance. As a large open area, Ain Hofra quite plainly

resembles our next instance.

The corresponding term *προσχαيرهτήρια and προχαριστήρια* is peculiar to rock-cut inscriptions of Lindus.²⁴ Some forty inscriptions are scattered over a rocky plateau that rises from the sea northeast of the soaring acropolis. About half of them, the longer ones, contain the nominative phrase *προσχάριος θυσία*. The two elements of the compound are *προ* + *ἐσχάρα*, with hyperthesis of *ε*.²⁵ This phrase is like the one at Ain Hofra and like the repeated clause of the tithing rules. At Lindus the noun phrase may be further qualified and in different ways: either 1) *βουκόπιος* “ox-cleaving” or *βουκοπίος* “for ox-cleaving [rites]” or *βουκοπίου* “oof the ox-cleaver,” scil. the deity, or 2) *θεοδαισία* “[rites of] dividing-for-the-god” or *θεοδαισίος* “[for rites of] dividing-for-the-god” or *τὸ θεοδαίσιον ἔτος* “the year of dividing-for-the god,” or 3) of “*Athanaphratria*,” just once, or 4) *οὐ βουκόπιος* “not ox-cleaving,” just once. The rites of “ox-cleaving” and “dividing-for-the-god” remind us of the quantities of meat carried away to a pure place in the sanctuary of Apollo.

All the inscriptions, with or without the phrase, serve to mark the spot that belongs to a certain party named in the genitive (except for the inscription at the *naiskos* as described below). It may be an individual person or persons, or the children or offspring or brothers, *παίδων* or *ἐγγόνων* or *ἀδελφῶν*, of some person. In another case it is a *thiasos*; in yet another a *patra*, a civic unit.²⁶ The various inscriptions are thinly scattered over a very large area, mostly at the periphery. The area is quite irregular, at its fullest extent some 130 m. north-south and 160 m. east-west. Much of it was used by many others besides the named proprietors. And it was used for a very long time. The inscriptions, dating from the sixth century to middle or late Hellenistic, belong to the latter days of a custom that must have begun with the first settlers of historical times. The earliest evidence consists of pottery and built remains at a point near the upper edge of the plateau. Here a small, two-room *naiskos* was very roughly constructed perhaps in the tenth century and used until perhaps the mid-sixth century, but was not replaced by any later building.²⁷ The various inscriptions are thinly scattered over a very large area, mostly at the periphery. The area is quite irregular, at its fullest extent some 130 m. north-south and 160 m. east-west. Much of it was used by many others besides the named proprietors. And it was used for a very long time. The inscriptions, dating from the sixth century to middle or late Hellenistic, belong to the latter days of a custom that must have begun with the first settlers of historical times. The earliest evidence consists of pottery and built remains at a point near the upper edge of the plateau. Here a small, two- room *naiskos* conferred by the excavators

is no doubt warranted by the two chambers and the eastward orientation but there is no altar in front. Instead, the simple phrase *βουκοπίους θυσία* “sacrifice for ox-cleaving [rites]” is here cut into the rock in deep regular letters of the beginning of the fourth century.

The terms *probomios* and *proscharaios* are fully equivalent. The word *eschara* “fireplace” may be used either of a hearth altar or of the metal fire pan set in the masonry of a regular altar.²⁸ In early days, so far as our evidence shows, the word is applied much more often, *pars pro toto*, to a regular altar than to a hearth altar, doubtless because the former was normative.²⁹

These inscriptions of Lindus seem to argue much activity at many altars. Yet the rocky ground has no cuttings anywhere for a regular altar and no trace of burning at an open hearth.³⁰ And the *naiskos* has no place of sacrifice inside or outside, only the general phrase corresponding to all the sites individually marked. Furthermore, the large irregular area is not enclosed as a sacred precinct, nor is any part of it. The only business to which the area is obviously suited is slaying and butchering animals on a large scale. The open ground slopes to the shore; it would be easy to restrict the animals, and easy to clean up.

The inscriptions do point to several unrelated deities, as if the business here conducted were common to them all. This has never been admitted. Scholars pursuing the notion of a precinct replete with altars assign the site to a single deity. They have seized on three different candidates.

Heracles was first, in virtue of an aetiological story referring to a cult at Lindus.³¹ The story turns on the custom of feasting in honor of the hero, who has the epithet *buthoinas* “ox-feaster.”³² Heracles in the course of his adventures comes to Thermydrae, the eastern port of Lindus. He is hungry and encounters a man with a pair of oxen and claims one of them for his meal. The man curses Heracles from a safe distance, but he only eats with greater relish. So it is that the worshippers curse merrily as they eat. We recognize a typical shrine of Heracles. It is not the extensive plateau, where other deities are in evidence and Heracles is not.

Dionysus was suggested next and with good reason.³³ The rites called *theodaisia* “dividing-for-the-god” are distinctive of Dionysus; the “year” called *theodaision* can only be a Dionysiac *trieteris*.³⁴ On the likeliest interpretation “the *thiasos* of Cochlis” in the earliest inscription of all is a Dionysiac *thiasos* headed by a woman.³⁵ The cult of Dionysus is well attested at Lindus, as also at Rhodes city.³⁶ The general feasting implicit in the festival name *Theodaisia* is never directly attested but would be very suitable for the many instances on Crete, where the festival served for the rehearsal of treaties and

perhaps for the enrolment of ephebes.³⁷

Athena *phratria* is the one deity indicated by name; so she came to be the choice of the principal excavator and is now generally preferred.³⁸ Yet she cannot possibly be intended in most of the inscriptions, as the deity of the rites of *theodaisia* or of *bukopia*. And it is merely fanciful to suppose that the area once served as the principal place of sacrifice for the acropolis cult of Athena.³⁹ Athena *phratria* belongs solely to one of the many groups who make use of the area, a certain civic unit.

If two deities as different as Dionysus and Athena are both present with their respective rites, the large open area does not belong to either as a sanctuary. And other deities as well must be represented on the plateau; Dionysus and Athena together do not account for all the sites variously inscribed. The commonest label is the unusual term *bukopia* “ox-cleaving (rites).” It also gives general notice at the place where the *naiskos* once stood. Like *theodaisia*, it will be distinctive of a particular deity. But now it is Apollo.

Sacrifice and Social Standing in the Cult of Apollo

The term *βοκοπία* at Lindus is matched by two other terms in the Dorian domain, *βοτομία* and *κοπος*. Thucydides refers to *βοτομία* “ox-cutting (rites)” in the cult of Apollo *pythaeus* at Asine (5.53). Antiquarian notices inform us of *κοπος* “cleaver” as the name of the great feast or feast-day of Apollo’s festival *Hyakinthia* at Amyclae.³⁹ Athena *phratria* belongs solely to one of the many groups who make use of the area, a certain civic unit.

If two deities as different as Dionysus and Athena are both present with their respective rites, the large open area does not belong to either as a sanctuary. And other deities as well must be represented on the plateau; Dionysus and Athena together do not account for all the sites variously inscribed. The commonest label is the unusual term *bukopia* “ox-cleaving (rites).” It also gives general notice at the place where the *naiskos* once stood. Like *theodaisia*, it will be distinctive of a particular deity. But now it is Apollo.

Sacrifice and Social Standing in the Cult of Apollo

The term *βοκόπια* at Lindus is matched by two other terms in the Dorian domain, *βοτάμια* and *κοπίς*. Thucydides refers to *βοτάμια* “ox-cutting (rites)” in the cult of Apollo *pythaeus* at Asine (5.53). Antiquarian notices inform us of *κοπίς* “cleaver” as the name of the great feast or feast-day of Apollo’s festival *Hyakinthia* at Amyclae.⁴⁰

The cult of Apollo *pythaeus* and the festival *Hyakinthia* are both widespread, both occurring also on Rhodes.⁴¹ Indeed the oracle of Delphi, alias *Pytho*, is only another cult of Apollo *pythaeus* that was first planted there in the dawning light of history. Much of the ritual will be constant. Now the cult at Asine and the festival at Amyclae are also illuminated by certain stories, and the stories are all of the same kind, about bastards or other inferior persons who are rebuffed. They are sometimes about butchering or feasting as well. And one of the stories of Asine leads on to Lindus.

Let us take Amyclae first; there is only a little to be said, but it is quite definite. We remember how the group of bastards called *Partheniai* “Maidens’ sons,” born of Spartan mothers and Helot fathers, were sent forth from Sparta to colonize Tarentum at the behest of the Delphic oracle.⁴² Before this, the fifth-century historian Antiochus imagines a dramatic incident during the festival celebration at Amyclae, always a famous spectacle (*FGrH* 555 F 13).⁴³ The *Partheniai* have secretly agreed to revolt; as a signal, their leader Phalanthus will put on a military cap, *pilos*—but the herald forbids him to do so, and the revolt comes to nothing.⁴⁴ The imaginary scene reproduces a familiar piece of ritual. The herald always gives a command for Spartan youths to put on their military caps: they have just come of age and are enrolled as citizens at Apollo’s festival, and this is the very moment of graduation, a proud moment indeed. Any who are denied citizenship, bastards for example, do not share the proud moment.⁴⁵ In the usual way of aetiology, Antiochus feigns that it all began when a revolt of bastards was foiled by forbidding the leader to put on his cap.⁴⁶

Perhaps the moment came just before the feast called *kopis*, inasmuch as graduating youths would join the feast for their first, delightful enjoyment of citizenship. At an earlier stage, still acting as ephebes, they may have hoisted the animals up to the altar for the slaying.

Asine deserves fuller treatment. In 419 b.c. Epidaurus was accused by Argos of disrespecting the common shrine of Apollo *pythaeus*, which Argos had in charge: she omitted to send the offering that was due *ὑπὲρ βοταμίων* “for the sake of ox-cutting rites” (Thuc. 5.53).⁴⁷ The shrine, which has been excavated, goes back to the Dryopian inhabitants whom Argos conquered and expelled in c. 700 b.c.⁴⁸ Dryopians lived on elsewhere in the Argolid, and despite the avowed expulsion it is likely that remnants were incorporated both at Argos and at Epidaurus, to be attested by the story of Deiphontes examined further on. These facts are background first of all to a famous old story of Heracles, of how he encountered Dryopians near Delphi and seized and butchered an ox—the story of Heracles at

Lindus is only a variation. The very ritual of “ox-cutting” becomes the hero’s geste of butchering. Another old story is of Heracles’ son Tlepolemus, of how he fled from the Argolid to Rhodes—and sailed from Asine, though this has not been recognized. A later story about Deiphontes, son-in-law of Temenus, straightforwardly depicts the fraught relations of Argos, Epidaurus, and Asine. Now Heracles, Tlepolemus, and Deiphontes all have this in common, that they are outcasts or inferiors, by reason of parentage or marriage or both. At a later day they would not have qualified as citizens, or not as full citizens.

Heracles and wife Deianeira and son Hyllus trudge forlornly through central Greece. They encounter a Dryopian who typifies a settled and secure existence and also evokes the cult of Apollo. It may be an ox-driver named *Theiomenês* “With-the-god’s-strength,” or it may be a king, with or without an ox, named *Phylas* “Of-the-tribe” or *Laogoras* “Assembling-the-people.”⁴⁹ *Laogoras* is killed by Heracles “while feasting with his children in the precinct of Apollo”: a rather literal version, full of transparent envy and resentment. Or the ox-driver is unhelpful, and Heracles seizes and slays one of the animals and feeds his famished little child: the most endearing version, preferred by Callimachus.

In real life, Dryopians are a maritime people occupying some of the best harbors in southern Euboea and offshore islands and the Argolid, also settling as far away as Cyprus.⁵⁰ Asine alone was obnoxious to the Argives as they expanded.⁵¹ Dryopians are imagined in the neighborhood of Delphi or elsewhere in Heracles’ road only in virtue of the cult at Asine. The final twist is to make the encounter in central Greece an express *aition* of the cult and to say that the whole Dryopian race was transplanted from Parnassus or Oeta to Asine. Bacchylides tells the story in a *Paian* that includes two details relevant to the relationships described by Thucydides (fr. 4 Snell-Maehler). Heracles marks the boundary between Asine and Epidaurus with a “twisted olive,” and Melampus comes from Argos to embellish the cult even more.

The story of Heracles’ son Tlepolemus is to similar effect (Il. 2.653–70). He flees his homeland in epic style, having slain his uncle Lycymnius.⁵² “All the other sons and grandsons of Heracles” go after him. But they would not tolerate him anyway, for he is an alien, born of a captive woman taken from a distant city. The uncle was slain at Midea on the east side of the Argive plain; Asine is the closest port, and a port is needed because Tlepolemus departs, again in epic style, with both ships and followers. He sails to Rhodes, to its three cities (Lindus is named first).⁵³ It is said thereafter, without reference to the three cities, that his followers “settled in three groups according to

tribe.” Such a grouping is displayed at any festival of Apollo where the whole body of citizens assemble for some customary business. It is as if Tlepolemus has brought Apollo’s ritual from Asine to Rhodes.

The origin of the captive woman is somehow important to the story. Heracles took her, Astyoche by name (“Having-a-town”), after sacking “Ephyra beside the river Selleeis” (lines 658–60). This fabled city is not known otherwise as a conquest of Heracles; the conquest has been invented for the purpose at hand. Where exactly is “Ephyra beside the river Selleeis”? (There was another authentic “Ephyra” or maybe two in early days.) It was once ruled by Sisyphus, whose son Almus succeeded to the kingship of Orchomenus in west Boeotia (*Il.* 6.152, Paus. 9.34.10, 36.1). Heracles, when he sacked it, was helping the Aetolians (so Eustathius *ad loc.*). Odysseus sailed there from Ithaca, and Telemachus might have too, or else to Sparta (*Od.* 1.259, 2.328). Corinth, jealous of epic fame, fancied itself as Ephyra, a transformation we can safely credit to Eumelus. Ephyra is neighbor then to west Boeotia and to Aetolia; it is on a sea route east of Ithaca that leads also to Corinth. It can only be the Mycenaean citadel of Ayios Georghios, near Delphi and above the river Pleistus, the most imposing Mycenaean ruin that up to now has lacked a legendary name.⁵⁴ It is said thereafter, without reference to the three cities, that his followers “settled in three groups according to tribe.” Such a grouping is displayed at any festival of Apollo where the whole body of citizens assemble for some customary business. It is as if Tlepolemus has brought Apollo’s ritual from Asine to Rhodes.

Commentators afterward explained that Astyoche was wife of the king of Ephyra slain by Heracles, *Phylas* by name (so Eustathius again). Now *Phylas* is the usual name of the Dryopian king who is slain by Heracles.⁵⁵ We see that Homer has simply recast the old story in epic style: the Dryopians as neighbors of Delphi have become the great city of Ephyra. Heracles sacks the city, carries off a Dryopian princess, and begets a Dryopian son, all in epic style. Tlepolemus and his band of followers, with their ships at the ready, are derivative Dryopians of Asine. It was in this exciting fashion that the cult of Apollo *pythaeus*, those *bokopia* rites, were carried from the Argolid to Rhodes, especially Lindus.

One other story points to the cult at Asine and to citizens of lesser standing. Temenus and his sons are of the proud line of Heracles who mostly inherit the Argolid; *Τήμενος* as a late addition to the lore of Heraclids may well be named, with metrical lengthening, for Apollo’s *τέμενος* as the place of citizen assemblies. In a story that embroils Argos and Epidaurus, Temenus gives his daughter Hyrnetho to a lesser Heraclid named Deiphontes, a ruler of Epidaurus, who thus becomes heir to Argos as well.⁵⁶ The resentful sons of Temenus murder their

father, then attempt to carry off Hyrnetho from Epidaurus. Hyrnetho, having pitifully lost her life, becomes a heroine worshipped in an olive grove; a “twisted olive” that is somehow related marks the boundary between Epidaurus and Asine; Hyrnetho is also eponym of a fourth tribe at Argos, beside the three Dorian ones. The ethnic element personified by Hyrnetho can only be Dryopian. Euripides brought some part of the story to the stage round the time that Argos and Epidaurus went to war, but presumably he favored Argos.⁵⁷

To sum up, the “ox-cutting” rites of Apollo *pythaeus* at Asine are the subject of old stories that show lesser kinds of citizen, bastards and the like, being treated with harsh discrimination. Such persons are present at the shrine, they have joined the assembly of citizens, but they have no part in the opulent feasting. If they are nonetheless required to supply animals for sacrifice, they are like the tithed class at Cyrene.

The plateau at Lindus was used from the earliest days for “ox-cleaving” rites that consist of nothing more than the slaughtering of animals, without further ceremony. These are rites of Apollo, but afterwards the plateau accommodated also the rites of at least two other deities, Dionysus’ rites of “dividing-for-the-god” and rites of Athena as deity of a *patra*, both likewise without further ceremony. The levy of animals imposed on lesser kinds of citizen was on such a scale that it required a place apart. And it was extended from the cult of Apollo to those others. Perhaps Ain Hofra near Cyrene also served for such general use.

The Tithed Class

The tithed persons of our inscription are required to sacrifice animals in large numbers and to deposit the meat at some convenient place. They fit the profile of lesser citizens that we discern elsewhere. How then did such a class originate at Cyrene, and how did it continue until now?

Cyrene was first colonized and later reinforced by contingents from Thera, Crete, Rhodes, and the Peloponnesus, Dorian areas where the cult of Apollo *pythaeus* flourished, together with this way of treating lesser citizens. The treatment of bastards at Apollo’s festival forms an incident prior to Sparta’s colonizing of Tarentum. Otherwise, colonizing stories suppress any mention of local custom for the greater glory of Delphi. There is however that recurring story type in which some group of people in some way distressed— they may be captives or exiles—are referred to without explanation as either *dekatê* “tithe” or *aparchê* “firstlings,” while being dispatched by Delphi to the destination where we find alleged descendants.⁵⁸ Though most of the

stories are quite fanciful, the first Chalcidian settlers of Rhegium are so described.⁵⁹ In such stories, we may substitute for “Delphi” a local practice of directing a group of lesser citizens to a new home.

In Herodotus’ account of the founding of Cyrene, the first settlers are depicted in a cursory fashion as fully representative of families on Thera— brothers draw lots (4.153). Yet their leader Battus is a bastard, his mother a foreign concubine purchased from a merchant with the stigma of unchastity (4.154–55.1).⁶⁰ Her place of origin is Oaxus on Crete, where the cult of Apollo *pythios* is not only attested epigraphically, as on Thera, but is also illustrated by a remarkable document setting forth the ritual obligations and permissions of *xenoi* and *astoi*, a class of “resident aliens” and a class of “townsmen” (*SEG* 23.566, 37.743).⁶¹ Oaxus was an important place in early days and not unknown to legend. Remarkably, the legends are of the same tenor as Herodotus’ tale of Battus. The city founder “Oaxus” is a bastard fathered by Apollo on a daughter of Minos, suitably named *Ἀκακᾶλλίς* “Not base, the little one”; in a secondary story she bears another bastard and city founder to Hermes (Xenon *FGrH* 273 F 30, Alexander Polyhistor *FGrH* 460 F 10).⁶² In these stories the mother is at fault. In Cretan inscriptions we sometimes find metronymics, the mother’s name used instead of the father’s; perhaps these are bastards by reason of a lesser father.⁶³

The first settlers of Cyrene therefore included bastards or even consisted of them only. Later contingents came from far and wide, and we may suppose that the means of recruitment varied. In the new land bastards became full citizens but did not forget their origin; they harped on it in stories of Battus. And everyone was faithful to the ritual of Apollo, with its differing treatment of full and lesser citizens.

Apart from immigration, Cyrene prospered and grew and admitted new citizens. As in other Greek cities, these would often be the offspring of a citizen father and a mother who was either a secondary wife or a foreigner.⁶⁴ Such unions were very likely common in the form of intermarriage with Libyan women. According to Ptolemy’s *diagramma*, which follows our inscription at no great interval, the mixed offspring of all Libyan women native to the Cyrenaica belong to the general body of citizens and are not excluded from the active body of the Ten Thousand. Among them we might find persons both high and low. Landowners whose land was farther off might resort to intermarriage for the sake of good relations. Those with livelihoods that took them away from the city might resort to intermarriage for convenience and security.

So the old custom applies also to subsequent conditions. When new citizens of this kind join in worship at Apollo’s sanctuary, they are known as the “tithed.” We might expect them however to be so

called rather than so treated; old customs are more often for show than for practical effect. We might expect the tithe to be relaxed—to be either forgiven altogether or perpetuated only in token form, like the tithe announced by dedications. The very words *δεκάτη* and “tithe” are a prime example of figurative speech.

But the inscription insists on many things that might be neglected otherwise, on bodily pollutions and on certain rites of Artemis and on certain forms of so-called suppliant purification. Above all, it holds the tithed class to a strict accounting. Such is the purpose of the inscription, abetted by all the other things. The tithed class will not be pleased. Yet many more will be gratified by the meat so amply provided. It is a downright populist measure.

1. The word is often employed in Cyrenaean inscriptions, chiefly dedications: Dobias-Lalou (2000, 110–11, 208).

2. The tithing so mysteriously mentioned in the stories has often, ever since Wilamowitz (1927, 164), been compared with the tithing of our inscription, but to little purpose. We come back to it at the end.

3. The instrumental dative *αἷμι, αἷτι* is used only twice, at lines 33 and 69, doubtless to save space. There is no reason to think that the mode of purifying varies.

4. “Purification of the sacred area, usually by pig’s blood, before an important festival or on a regular calendar basis was no doubt a general practice”: Parker (1983, 30n66). It is a solemnity like washing one’s hands at a lustral basin, but in a higher degree. (Parker does not so interpret the purification of the tithing rules: see ns. 5–6 below.)

5. So Parker (1983, 341–43), Rhodes and Osborne on GH197, pp. 503–4.

6. Parker (1983, 342) suggests that tithed persons are guilty of or afflicted by “sacriligious pollutions, which could embrace almost any breach of religious rules.” But the uniform severity of the tithing rules cannot be meant for very miscellaneous offenders.

7. See Parker (1983, 209, 275–76). As we saw, Apollo’s mandate does not extend to homicide pollution ([chapter 15](#), pp. 243–44).

8. Perhaps we should render “carry *them* away.” The translation we often meet with, “carry *it* away,” implies that only the latter sacrifice is meant.

9. For the usual requirement—the many instances and their interpretation—see Goldstein (1978, 51–54, 322–55) and Scullion (1994, 99–112). Earlier discussions by Ziehen (*LGS* 239, 340) and Thomsen (1909) are still of value. Scullion argues, as against everyone before him, that the requirement is distinctive of “chthonian” ritual, which is improbable. It is in any case, significantly for the present purpose, well attested in cults of Apollo.

10. In the calendar of the deme Erchia (SEG 21.541), where the prohibition is attached to twenty-two out of fifty-six sacrifices, it is often abbreviated further:

οὐ φορ, οὐ φο, οὐ φ, ο φορ.

11. The four instances all appear in two calendars of Cos, *LSCG* 151 and 154: see Goldstein (1978, 342–44).

12. *LSJ* s. *κορ, σκορσκορν*, *LSJ Suppl.* s. *κορκαρ, κορκιρν*. For the meaning “basket,” see chapter 17, pp. 270–71.

13. So Frisk, *GEW* and Chantraine, *DELG* s. *κορ*.

14. The wider and later currency of forms in κ- tells against Fraenkel's suggestion that initial σ was added by analogy with either σκεός? or σπνρος.

15. Such a basket goes with leather sacks (Epicharmus, Pherecrates) and is used for barley meal, a staple food kept in quantity (Antiphanes, Pollux).

16. So Parker (1983, 343), Rhodes and Osborne *ad loc.* (503–4).

17. The debate over ἀῖνηβος and εἰνηβος is superseded by the undoubted reading εἰνηβος. Schol. Theocr. 8.3 distinguishes anēbos and enēbos as boy and adolescent, under and over age fifteen. The former was the usual choice in line 40, wrongly in any case. The pollution consists of submitting to a man's solicitation, as of an adolescent. A boy may be vulnerable too, but less commonly, and an adolescent could not go unmentioned.

18. Comment on this passage has been notably anachronistic. Maas thinks of masturbation as the secret vice, and Parker (1983, 76n9, 342) does not quite rule it out. Sokolowski thinks of the seduction of a maiden, for he restores lines 75–78 to this effect as a virtual supplement to lines 40–42 (cf. chapter 17, p. 272). Rhodes and Osborne discount any “sexual act” but suggest nothing else.

19. A citizen in any city may wish to bequeath his property or part of it to a son born of an irregular union—the union may be formed for the very purpose. The law will generally recognize this heir as a citizen, but of a lesser kind. At Cyrene, Libyan women in particular would not always be taken in legal marriage. See p. 317 below.

20. Such is the usual understanding of this section; cf. Parker (1983, 343–44).

21. We implicate the gods in our own base designs, Ion sadly remarks, “either by slayings of animals in front of the altar or by birds' wings,” i.e. by resorting to divination in its two principal forms.

22. [θυσία] / [θεοδαΐσι]ος is not far-fetched in the light of a whole series of inscriptions at Lindus.

23. The beginning of line 7 is reported as ΑΓ; perhaps Απ[ολλον-].

24. Blinkenberg (1941, nos. 581–86, [s. *Vfin.*], 590, 592, 595–97, 599–600 [s. *IVinit.*], 601–2, 604–5 [s. *IV med.*], 606–8, 610–14 [s. *IVp. post.*], 617 [s. *III-II*]). Kostomitsopoulos (1988) = *SEG* 38.788 (s. *IV med.*). Blinkenberg (p. 908) cites the analogy of προβώμιος at Cyrene.

25. So Hiller von Gaertringen (after Dittenberger) on *SIG*³ 1035, Blinkenberg (1941, 908), Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 1.398, 436, 2.508. The word has escaped the etymological dictionaries of Frisk and Chantraine s. ἐσχάρα. It cannot in any

fashion be derived from χαιρω, as proposed by Kostomitsopoulos (1988, 125–26), who compares the glosses

προσχαίρητήρια and προχαριστήρια used of rites for Athena or Koré at Athens. Ekroth (2002, 33–34) objects as well but on the grounds that the Athenian rites are far away and apparently unrelated, which is a circular argument.

26. A “*thiasos*” appears in no. 580, s. VI, the earliest inscription. The *Grennadaï* of no. 616, s. III or later, worshippers of Athena *phratría*, are an avowed *patra*, not *phratry* (cf. Sherwin-White [1978, 168]).

27. The associated pottery and figurines range from Protogeometric to the mid-sixth century. Though the latest material is much the commonest, as we expect, the earliest suffices to show the beginning of activity and probably of a built shrine. Ekroth (2002, 31), citing Sørensen and Pentz on the pottery, is unduly skeptical.

28. *LSJ Rev. Suppl.* s. ἐσχάρα is an entry thoroughly rewritten that shows the range and development of meaning.

29. See the full discussion of Ekroth (2002, 25–37).

30. The most that Blinkenberg could say on behalf of altars is as follows (1941,

907–8): “Here and there the rock presents quite close to the inscription a flat surface which would appear well suited to the immolation of the victim; in other cases there is not a suitable place in the immediate neighborhood.” As we saw, the inscriptions are thinly scattered over a very large area. It was harder to find a smooth face for an inscription than a flat expanse for slaying animals.

31. So Dittenberger in *SIG*² and Hiller von Gaertringen at an early stage, as cited by Pfeiffer (1922, 88), who is about the last adherent. Pfeiffer here (78–102) reconstructs Callimachus’ version of the story otherwise than he did later, in the light of more papyri: *Aetia* I frs. 22–23 = 24–25 Massimilla. The inscriptions of Lindus are no longer cited in illustration of Callimachus.

32. For the testimonia, see Pfeiffer (1922, 89–101), Morelli (1959, 54–56, 147–49); for the interpretation, Nilsson (1906, 450–51).

33. So Nilsson (1906, 279–80), Hiller von Gaertringen on *SIG*³ 1035 and *RE Suppl.* 5 (1931) 770 s. Rhodos.

34. It is sometimes evident and always arguable that Dionysus is the god of the festival *Theodaisia*, imprinted also in the month name *Theodaisios*, widely attested in the Dorian and Aeolian domains. See further Robertson (2003b, 229–32). The festival is not attested on Rhodes, however, and in our inscriptions the term *theodaisia* is used descriptively, like *bokopia*; it is only a rite, not a festival.

35. So Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*³ 1035 n. 1. Blinkenberg (1941, 910–11) argues that *Cochlis* is aman and that the *thiasos* is a private cult association. Man or woman, the name does not appear in *LGPN* I.

36. Morelli (1959, 37–42, 122–26).

37. For Dionysus on Crete see Sporn (2002, 388) (a table) and passim. Sporn (334) suggests the enrollment of ephebes. The sacrificial calendar of Eleutherna in a broken passage contains the phrase “of the third year”—perhaps referring to Dionysus, perhaps to the *Theodaisia*—and after it the rule *ouk apophora* (*SEG* 41.744 = Lupu [2005, no. 23 B 7–8]).

38. So Blinkenberg (1941, 903–6), Morelli (1959, 86–88).

39. According to Blinkenberg, the Dorian colonizers brought a custom of sacrificing oxen to Athena but did not at first venture to disturb a custom of

ἀπυρα ἱερά addressed to an indigenous deity of the acropolis. The cult site on the plateau is thought of as illustrating a long process of assimilation.

40. For the sources and their meaning see Nilsson (1906, 131–34, 188–89) and Bolte (1929, 134–37).

41. *Apollopythios orpythaeus* at Cameirus, Lindus, and Rhodes city: Morelli (1959, 25–27, 102, 108–10) (the cult is in fact most prominent at Lindus). Month *Hyakinthios* at Rhodes city: Trümper (1997, 167–68).

42. As often, we suspect that Delphi is credited with a decision made locally. On this topic see Londey (1990). He summarizes all the reasons for discounting the role of Delphi in foundation stories but still maintains, unnecessarily it seems to me, that just a few cities did consult Delphi, including Sparta.

43. Antiochus mentioned another distinguishing mark of Spartan bastards, which is only half reported by Strabo as our intermediate source: “the citizens were known by their long hair.” By contrast, the bastard chief *Φάλανθος* is named for his lack of hair.

44. Scholars in general take the scene or something like it as the literal record of a “failed coup.” They are more confident of ancient conspiracies than we could ever be of modern ones.

45. Accordingly, the festival of Amyclae once served to demonstrate the exclusion of the *Partheniai* from citizenship. It had the same practical effect as the alleged oracle directing them to Tarentum; it is the hard reality behind the pious story.

46. Athens' festival *Synokia* has a similar custom and a similar story, with Solon donning the *pilos* in exemplary fashion: Robertson (1998a, 301). This summer reunion of citizens, invoking the phratry deities Zeus and Athena in a perfunctory fashion, was created at the time when the enrollment of citizens, now drawn from the whole of Attica, was transferred from a summer festival of Apollo, the *Hekatombaia*, to the phratry festival of autumn, the *Apaturia*. Both the old way and the new are faithfully reflected in successive stages of the biography of Theseus.

47. Commentators often find difficulty with the reading (see Andrewes *ad loc.*), but there is none.

48. Strid (1999) assembles all the evidence for Dryopians real and fictitious. On p. 87 he suggests very briefly that Dryopians were made the subject of fanciful stories only after Asine was destroyed by Argos, in the sole light of the surviving shrine of Apollo. But stories so manifold cannot originate so late, and Dryopians became less interesting when they were subdued.

49. *Theodamas*: Callim. *Aetia* fr. 24 Pfeiffer = 26 Massimilla line 6, etc. *Phylas*: note 55. *Laogoras*: Apld. *Bibl.* 2.7.7.3 (2.155).

50. The distribution shows them to be Ionian, though somehow distinct from the Ionian traditions of Troezen and of other parts of the Peloponnesus. On their role as a reputed *ethnos*, beside Ionians and others, see Robertson (2002, 23–25).

51. Like Nauplia, the harbor of Asine was later left unused by the lubberly Argives.

52. There is a curious detail. Licymnius is struck a fatal blow with a club of olive wood (Pind. *Ol.* 7.2730). Perhaps the club is more correctly used to stun an ox at the hands of a young man during sacrifice at Apollo's shrine. Such a practice might also give rise to the "twisted olive" at the boundary, mentioned before, and the olive grove of Hynetho, mentioned below.

53. Homer is far from implying that Tlepolemus and his followers are the first Greek settlers: see Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1970, 118).

54. Hope Simpson (1981, 77) describes the ruins, near the village of *Chryso*. "Crisa," however, is only another form of "Cirra," the harbor site at the mouth of the Pleistus: Robertson (1978b, 40–48).

55. *Phylas* the Dryopian king: Diod. 4.37.1–2, Paus. 4.34.9, *Tabula Albana*, IG 14.1293 = *FGrH* 40, lines 68–76.

56. For full details see Robert (1921, 665–68). More recently, papyrus remains have appeared of arguments to one or both of Euripides' plays on the subject (Kannicht nos. 68–69, pp. 719–24).

57. On metrical grounds *Temenidae* is assigned to Euripides' last period, 422–406 B.c. (Kannicht p. 726). So it may have been produced during the conflict, otherwise just before or sometime after. Athens gave effective aid to Argos against Epidaurus and Sparta (Thuc. 5.55.4–56.I, 75.5–6, 77.2, 80.3).

58. The instances are extremely diverse, though including as we expect Dryopians bound for Asine. Mari (1999) offers a thorough treatment. Her purpose is to analyze each separate tradition and to refute all the general explanations that have been proposed. Yet she rightly concludes that any underlying customs belong not to Delphi but to the wider Greek world.

59. Chalcidian colonists as tepot
ἱεροὶ τοῦ θεοῦ οἱ δεκατευθέντες: Diod. 8.32.2, Str. 6.1.6, p. 260, after Ephorus; cf. Mari (1999, 264, 266–67, 275–76, 281–83). At Chalcis we happen to hear of a splendid temple of Apollo *delphinios* (Plut. *Tit.* 16.5).

60. It is in consequence of bastardy that Battus is described as an unprepossessing person and is given a mocking name. To be ill favored and oddly named is characteristic of city founders; they may all be bastards without the record showing it.

61. Apollo *pythios* on Thera: Braun (1932, 23). Inscription of Oaxus: Manganaro (1966, 11–18) / *SEG* 23.566 = Sokolowski, *LSCG* 145 / *SEG* 25.1024 = van Effenterre (1985) / *SEG* 37.743, cf. *BE* 1988.877 = Bile (1988, no. 34) / *SEG* 38.889. The middle part of Manganaro's text is markedly improved by van Effenterre, but more could be done before a full interpretation is attempted. The inscription is desperately hard to read not only because of wear but also because the surface was unsuitable to begin with, and the language is barely intelligible as a disjointed report of clauses enacted by decree.

62. The womenfolk of Minos always misbehave. Battus' mother, though sold on Thera to be a concubine, is the daughter of a later *basileus* of Oaxus, falsely accused of fornication by a stepmother.

63. So Chaniotis (2002).

64. It is the subject of Ogden (1996). The useful term *mêtroxenoî* is in fact of rare occurrence.

Rites of Artemis

Synopsis

Another long section deals with rites of Artemis, the pollution of miscarriage being added as makeweight. It too is carefully devised so as to balance the tithing rules, which are rites of Apollo. Compared with the tithing rules, the section on Artemis has little practical importance, but sets forth a customary preparation for young women as they enter marriage. Such ritual is reassuring to newcomers and to the community at large. For us it is uniquely informative; it is a systematic exposition of practices and beliefs that inspire many of the myths of Artemis.

A young woman goes to the sanctuary of Artemis on three occasions, as bride-to-be, as new bride, and when about to be delivered of her first child. (1) Shortly before the wedding, the bride-to-be sleeps in the so-called bedchamber overnight, partnered by a magic instance or a magic image of the strapping boy she hopes to bear. (2) After the wedding, the new bride attends a public festival of Artemis without undue delay. She sacrifices a goat she has chosen specially and leaves behind, as a magic token of herself, the animal's hide and head and feet. (3) The expectant mother returns to the sanctuary as her term approaches, on a holy day of Artemis, the sixth or sixteenth of the month, and presents the magic token to the priestess called the Bear. The bear species beyond all others is strong and sure in producing and fostering its young; so this is yet another case of magical analogy.

Each stage can be recognized in famous old stories and in lesser aetiologies that refer to cults throughout the Greek world; Artemis was the most popular deity of all. The best-known sanctuaries are as usual Athenian, at Munichia and Brauron. They offer parallels throughout, and especially for the Bear priestess. We need to distinguish the priestess from the little Bears of age five to ten, a democratic institution of the later fifth century that puts old custom to new use.

Old Customs for Young Women

The tithing rules were a long section evenly divided into five subsections often lines each (lines 33–82). We come next to a section not quite so long, rites of Artemis, divided less evenly into three subsections of eight, six, and nine lines each (lines 83–105). The tithing rules were about sacrificing in the sanctuary of Apollo, and the sacrificial procedure was repeated in much the same language in each section. Rites of Artemis, including sacrifice, are conducted in the sanctuary Artemis shares with Apollo, and there is some repetition in the language, though necessarily less than before. The tithing rules were for men and also boys as owners or inheritors of tithed property. Rites of Artemis are for young women. Thus far the correspondence is plain. It is extended by another subsection about the impurity of miscarriage, a subject related to rites of Artemis (lines 106–9). We must take it as so related, or miscarriage intrudes inexplicably before another long section, the three forms of suppliant ritual (lines 110–41). The inscription is far from offering a general assortment of rules of purification; this was apparent from the outset. Had it been the purpose to offer a general assortment, miscarriage would find its place beside intercourse and childbirth (lines 11–20). In short, rites of Artemis, together with the impurity of miscarriage, have been compiled and inserted here so as to balance the tithing rules.

The tithed class of citizens were required to sacrifice copiously according to their worth and to surrender the meat for general distribution. The obligation would be resented by those on whom it bore; others would welcome it. Rites of Artemis have no such consequence. The only sacrifice that is prescribed, apart from penalties, is not onerous. If others share the meat, nothing is said about it, and in any case the rules are the same for all citizen women. So what immediate relevance can they possess? It was suggested above that the tithed class may be especially the offspring of mixed marriages with Libyan women, conspicuous as these offspring are in Ptolemy's *diagramma*. Pursuant to this view, the tithing rules find a corollary in the rites of Artemis, addressed to young women now growing up as citizens of Cyrene. They need to be told what to do, for their Libyan mothers cannot teach them. The lesson is strict and enforced by penalties. It is the penalty clauses that repeat exactly the language of the tithing rules: purifying the shrine, sacrificing a full-grown animal as a penalty. So the same explanation seems to fit the peculiarities of the two principal sections of our inscription, the tithing rules and the rites of Artemis. Each is a means of assimilating new citizens.

With such a purpose, the tithing rules were more explicit than

usual about some customary practices of the cult of Apollo. The section on Artemis is even more explicit; it is uniquely revealing. None of these rites is described for us elsewhere in any definite way, either in literature or in documents. And yet they all prove to be familiar. We shall recognize each of them in the reflection of myth and legend and in the glimpses of women's life afforded by vase painting, sanctuary dedications, and New Comedy. The huntress Artemis and her nymphs were first imagined in the distant past as the counterpart of the ritual here prescribed, and they always continued to evoke it.

The Bedchamber and the Bride-Place

At the sanctuary of Artemis two destinations are involved, the *koitaterion* "bedchamber" and the *nymphaeion* "bride-place." What sort of places are they? One simply "goes" to the *koitaterion* or "comes" to Artemis for the purpose (lines 86, 88–89, cf. 83 as restored). But one "comes down" or "goes down" to the *nymphaeion* and to Artemis (lines 91–92, 93, 95, 99–100 *bis*, 101, 102, cf. 97 as restored). These habitual expressions are undoubtedly significant. The term *koitaterion* < *koite* means "bedchamber"; it is therefore a room within a building. If *nymphaeion* < *nymphē* "bride" were also a room, it would be one at a lower level of a building, distinguished by the compound verbs "come down" and "go down." This is unlikely in itself, and such a room, the "bride-chamber," would only duplicate the "bedchamber," for the context shows that the bed in question is a marriage bed.

It follows that the *nymphaeion* is not a room but an area—some part of the great sanctuary reserved for the corresponding ritual. The whole sanctuary is at a lower level, below 580 m. of elevation, than the rest of the city at the east, mostly above 600 m. It is reached from the east by a road descending through a valley. Everyone "comes down" or "goes down" to the sanctuary or to any lesser area within it. There is a matching epithet for Artemis herself, *katagogis* "bringing down" (*SEG* 9.13 line 12)—she brings down worshippers to her sanctuary.¹ But this general perspective is not so apt for a room within a building, to which one simply "comes" or "goes" while visiting the sanctuary at large.

The *koitaterion* then is a particular room, and the *nymphaeion* is a certain area. Let us scan the great sanctuary for a particular room and a certain area. As to the room, only the temple of Artemis presents itself.² Artemis and Apollo are side by side in the sanctuary, Artemis at the north with a much smaller temple and a somewhat smaller altar. The temple consists of two rooms and a porch without a colonnade. It is noteworthy that the rear chamber is about twice as large as the cella.

Temples of Artemis often have a separate rear chamber, albeit smaller— such are the excavated temples at Brauron and Halae Araphenides and Aulis, sites famous in story.³ The term *adyton* is commonly applied to it, on the analogy of the inner chamber so called in Apollo’s temple at Delphi.⁴ There is warrant also in a story about Artemis’ cult at Munichia, turning on the ruse by which a young woman is hidden “in the *adyton*” while a goat is sacrificed in her place (Paus. Att. s. *ἔμβαρὸς εἶμι* Brauron, where the temple is small and the rear chamber very cramped, there is another small building close by at the southeast, facing the temple but nestled in a cleft of the rocky hill.⁶ Of somewhat later date, it consists of a substantial square room and an anteroom: perhaps this was an improvement upon the rear chamber of the temple. Inscriptions of Brauron, both an inventory of 416/15 b.c. and a law of the *nomothetai*, c. 300–250 b.c., employ the phrase *ὁ νεώς, ὃ τε ἀρχαῖος καὶ ὁ παρθενών* “the temple, both the old building and the maiden’s chamber” to refer to a building or buildings on the site (*SEG* 52.51, *SEG* 52.104 lines 3–4).⁷ Perhaps the phrase refers to the temple and to the other small building respectively; it seems not to fit any other extant remains.

Now the *koitaterion* of our inscription might just as well be called a *παρθενών* “maiden’s chamber” since it accommodates a bride-to-be before ever she lies with her husband. Surely it is the rear chamber of the temple, capacious as it is.

The *nymphaeion* is an area visited at festivals of Artemis. It is visited first by a new bride when she attends a festival shortly after the wedding; she returns to it as an expectant mother for a private rite that follows from the previous use. The great sanctuary incorporates a natural feature obviously suited to the worship of Artemis. All along the south side, at the foot of the acropolis, there are abundant springs that were improved through the centuries for both practical and ritual use.⁸ Artemis and Apollo are not often found side by side as they are at Cyrene. Since Apollo is the premier deity of the city, the cult of Artemis was probably attracted to the same place by the springs.⁹ At different times two installations have been proposed as the *nymphaeion*. “The fountain of Kyra” is a decorative element of the “terrace of fountains” at the west end.¹⁰ East of the sanctuary, just south of the road but shielded from it by a high wall, a series of individual rooms and basins are cut into the cliff face.¹¹ Either identification seems possible, but no more. The springs, with or without some improvement, might be the *nymphaeion*.

Alternatively, it might be just a large open space occupied by the festival celebrants, if they are typically *nymphai* “brides.” It would still be distinct from the *Artamition* entire, including temple and altar.

A *nympha* “bride” goes to the shrine of Artemis on three occasions. The first occasion, the visit to the bedchamber, is prior even to the wedding (lines 83–90). After the wedding the bride first joins her husband in the same house and lies with him; the visit must take place before this. If she omits the visit of her own will, she must purify the shrine of Artemis and sacrifice a full-grown animal as a penalty, and then she must still visit the bedchamber. But if she omits it against her will, she has only to purify the shrine. The two cases and the two penalties are just the same as with a lad of the tithed class— he is after all subject to the same importunity (chapter 20, p. 305). The full penalty, both purifying and sacrificing, is also imposed on the two following occasions if the new bride is remiss. It is the penalty so often repeated in the tithing rules as part of the obligation of the tithed class. The young woman, like the lad, seems to be thought of as belonging to this class.

What exactly is it that the bride-to-be does at the bedchambero “A bride on the one hand must go to the bedchamber to Artemis and undo her belt” (lines 83–84). So I have restored these lines at the top of column B, where the stone is damaged (chapter 17, pp. 273–74). Restoration operates within very narrow limits. The term *koitaterion* “bedchamber” and the duty of going there are repeated afterward (lines 88–89). The phrase ζ[ώναν / ... λῦσαι] “undo her belt” is virtually dictated by the initial letter ζ[by the space available, and by the place *koitaterion* where it occurs. This bedchamber in the shrine of Artemis is named for *koite* in the special sense of “marriage bed.” The ritual takes precedence of the marital union at home; before the bride comes to the real marriage bed, she disrobes and lies in one at the shrine of Artemis. The Suda s. λυσίζωνος γυνή “belt-undoing woman” offers this definition: “one who has lain with a man, inasmuch as maidens about to engage in intercourse dedicated their maiden belts to Artemis.” To say that a maiden “undoes her belt” to present it as a dedication does not describe the custom properly.¹² She has a better reason: to go to bed in the *koitaterion*.

By so doing, the bride-to-be hopes to enhance her fertility, to make sure of bearing a strong son. She shares the bed with a young boy chosen for the purpose, an ideal son with two ideal parents living. The rite is magical: the prospective mother is magically fortified by contact with, and by anticipation of, the desired result.¹³ This is one version of the custom; in another she lies with the image of an ideal son. The custom is attested by stories both early and late. Hellenistic poets with their fondness for local aetiologies refer unmistakably to the custom as practiced on Naxos, at Phaestus, and at Patrae. Earlier

stories are less explicit: Hera and Zeus as child lovers, a boy bedded with Theseus and Ariadne. And we shall find a trace of it at Athens in the scattered evidence for the several Athenian cults of Artemis.

1. Callimachus in *Aetia* Book 3 says the following of Cydippe, a girl of Naxos, as betrothed to Acontius, a lad of Ceos (fr. 75 lines 1–3).

ἦδη καὶ κούρῳ παρθένος εὐνάσατο,
τέθμιον ὥς ἐκέλευε προνύμφιον ὕπνον ἰαῦσαι
ἄρσενι τὰν τάλιν παιδὶ σὺν ἀμφιθαλεῖ.

“The maiden had already gone to bed with a boy, since custom required the bride-to-be (*talis*) to sleep a prenuptial sleep with a male child *amphithales*,” i.e. one whose parents are both living. Here is a capsule account with every detail mentioned. As we might expect, the bride remains for a whole night in the bedchamber, sleeping beside the boy. Callimachus does not need to tell us that the custom belongs to the cult of Artemis; Cydippe’s many trials began with a vow to this goddess. It is a custom of Naxos, where she lives and will be married and where it reappears in the famous story of Theseus mentioned below. Cydippe conducts herself just as our inscription requires a girl to do, visiting the bedchamber before she is married to Acontius.

2. Antoninus Liberalis, in summarizing Nicander of Colophon, says of a rite at Phaestus, νόμιμον δ’ ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς γάμοις πρότερον παρακλίνασθαι παρὰ τὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦ Λευκίππου “it is customary [for a woman] at marriage to lie down first beside the statue of that *Leukippos*” (*Met.* 17.6 = Nic. fr. 45 Schneider). Nicander’s story is about a girl who on growing up turned into a young man, Leto’s answer to a mother’s prayer.¹⁴ The stern father wanted only a boy, and she had been reared as one in disguise, with the name *Leukippos*. When the disguise was about to become impossible, the mother fled to the shrine of Leto and prayed for a genuine sex change. The statue is therefore of a boy; it is what the girl formerly looked like. At Phaestus the custom is to lie beside the image of an ideal boy, not beside an actual boy who is ideal.

It might be asked whether the original custom always involved an actual boy, so that an image was only a later substitute. Probably not; many magic rites make use of an image, always more tractable than the original. At Phaestus the image has a name, *Leukippos* “White-horse,” which must be antecedent to Nicander’s story. It is a fine name for an ideal male, a name to be fondly used in the cult. The next story will introduce us to *Melanippos* “Black-horse” as another apparent name for the image.

Phaestus’ custom belongs to Leto rather than Artemis. So far as

the record shows, Leto is worshipped at eight Cretan cities.¹⁵ At four of them, she joins Artemis and Apollo to make up *la sacra famiglia*, as it has been called (Hierapytna, Olous, Drerus, Cydonia). At another three, Artemis as well as Leto is attested by herself (Lato, Gortyn, Oaxus). But at Phaestus alone, which we know fairly well, Artemis has not appeared at all. Here, perhaps, Leto simply took the place of Artemis. The island of *Letoa*, known only for the name, lies off the coast west of Phaestus, likewise attesting her prominence.¹⁶

In any case, Nicander's story is straightforwardly deduced from Leto's cult.¹⁷ Both the title of the goddess and the name of her festival, or rather of the rite, are taken to refer to the sex change. Leto is called *φυντία*, we are told, because she made the girl sprout male genitals. But the true meaning is "procreative" of offspring, a usual function of either Leto or Artemis. "They call her festival *ἐκδύσια* 'disrobing [rites]' because *τὸν πέπλον ἢ παῖς ἐξέδυν* the child had taken off female dress." But "disrobing" is tantamount to going to bed, just like undoing one's belt. It is of course a rite performed at need, not a festival. A "festival" however is much the commonest form of commemoration in such tales, and it is easy to suppose that Nicander, or more likely Antoninus in his summary, has used the word indiscriminately.

3. At Patrae the cult of Artemis *triklaria* gives rise to a story of unhappy love, recounted by Pausanias with deep sympathy and sad reflections (7.19.1–20.2).¹⁸ It is unmistakably the ritual of the bedchamber. Pausanias draws on some ingenious Hellenistic writer who remains to be identified. Artemis *triklaria* owes her epithet to the synoecism of three earlier communities into the city of Patrae, which took place no later than the early fifth century. The precinct and the temple were on the bank of the river *Meilichos* north of the city; at the festival each year processioners went out from the acropolis of Patrae to the shrine by the river, among them children garlanded with ears of grain. It is rather like the *Skirophoria* procession at Athens, from the Acropolis to the river Cephissus, except that the Athenian observance marks the harvest and this one marks an earlier stage, when the grain has come into ear.¹⁹ Pausanias begins his tour of Patrae, then a Roman colony, on the city's lofty acropolis, then adorned with a cult of Artemis *laphria* that Augustus had transplanted from Aetolia.²⁰ Within the new shrine is a remnant of earlier days, the tomb of the hero Eurypylus. It provides the occasion for Pausanias to tell the story of unhappy love.

Artemis has a beautiful maiden priestess, serving only until she marries. A lad named *Melanippos* falls in love with her but is not acceptable to the father. Forbidden to marry, the young lovers anticipate the conjugal act within the very shrine of Artemis. Indeed

they do so many times—they regularly “use the shrine as a bride chamber”

ἐμελλον τῷ ἱερῷ... ἴσα καὶ θαλάμῳ χρῆσθαι. When a plague falls on the community, the remedy disclosed by an oracle is to sacrifice them both to Artemis and to continue the practice as the annual sacrifice of “a maiden and a

boy, παρθένον καὶ παῖδα.²¹ For many years “a boy and a maiden” are pitiably offered up; the child processioners garlanded with grain are a relic of this practice. The horrific penalty is abolished only when the hero Eurypylus happens to put in at Patrae during his return from Troy—this is Eurypylus of Thessaly, but he has made a detour to the Delphic oracle, being burdened with a chest containing a mask of Dionysus, spoils of war like the *Palladion* of Troy. It is another story altogether, an *aition* of the spring festival of Dionysus, with the god himself, i.e. the mask, arriving as usual from overseas.²² But the ingenious Hellenistic writer found it economical to say that an oracle predicting this event also made it the condition for ending the sacrifice of children. Artemis and Dionysus are both worshipped at about the same time in spring, and our author plays upon it, as does the story of Theseus to be mentioned below.

The story of Eurypylus’ advent at Patrae, alias Dionysus’ advent, is perhaps taken in the main from some local history of Achaea.²³ But not the moment of his landing, of his observing the sacrifice of a boy and a maiden in progress. This comes from the ingenious Hellenistic writer. And after describing the moment Pausanias records a variant notion of Eurypylus: “some have written” that he was a son of Dexamenus, king of neighboring Olenus, who accompanied Heracles to Troy. The identity of that Hellenistic writer is suddenly revealed. The love elegies of Hermesianax of Colophon were often in the hands of his countryman Pausanias; Pausanias’ citations constitute four out of twelve fragments; two of them refer to neighboring Dyme and Olenus.²⁴ As to Olenus Hermesianax wrote an elegy on the Centaur Eurytion (Paus. 7.18.1 = fr. 9 Powell). He therefore spoke of Heracles’ visit to king Dexamenus, mentioned likewise by Pausanias. The sad reflections will echo Hermesianax.²⁵ Our story of unhappy love can be added to the meager tally of his fragments.

What Eurypylus observed was children garlanded with grain going from the acropolis to the river *Meilichios*, the appointed victims of human sacrifice. The procession still continues, says Pausanias, and the children also return, garlanded now with ivy, from the river to the acropolis shrine of Dionysus *aisymnêtês*. All this he tells us apropos of Eurypylus and Dionysus on the acropolis. Afterwards, passing the river *Meilichios*, he only points to “the shrine of *triklaria*, ἄγαλμα οὐδὲν ἔτι ἔχον no longer containing an image” (7.22.11). It is evident that the cult had lapsed, apart from the

procession. At an earlier day there was a bedchamber where a bride often lay for a night with a boy or with the image of a boy, whence the story of *Melanippos* and the maiden priestess. Was *Melanippos*, like *Leukippos*, the name for a boy's image? Did *Hermesianax*, like *Nicander*, point to the image as attesting the story? It would be a good reason for *Pausanias* to say that an image was no longer to be seen.

4. Some stories are much older than these Hellenistic romances. We would not have known they were aetiological, had we not been told. Apropos of *Cydispe*, *Callimachus* evokes by *praetermissio* the story that *Zeus* and *Hera* slept together as children who eluded their parents (fr. 75 lines 4–9, cf. *Il.* 14.295–96). *Callimachus* implies, and *Homer's* scholiast expressly says, that this is an *aition* of the prenuptial custom.²⁶ Our story of unhappy love can be added to the meager tally of his fragments.

5. On a red-figure *lekythos*, c. 460 b.c., *Athena* summons *Theseus* from the bed where *Ariadne* lies sleeping and where a boy lies the other way round (*Tarentum*, Mus. Naz. 4545). As others have said, the scene alludes to our custom.²⁷ The boy's position vis-a-vis *Ariadne* is that of a newborn child. This pictorial rendering is explicit in a way that no literary source could be; it was the painter of the *lekythos* who first added the boy to the mythical scene. The net result is to show us that *Theseus* himself is only a double of the boy. *Ariadne* consorts with him, as with the boy, on a night preliminary to her wedding with *Dionysus*. So the ritual background was familiar to the painter and his customers. It must have been generally familiar. When the story is varied on behalf of other ritual (*Plut. Thes.* 20.3–7, citing *Paeon* of *Amathus* *FGrH* 757 F 2), the *Naxian* ritual is taken as known.

A little more should be said about these coinciding customs of *Artemis* and *Dionysus*. *Artemis* is typically honored in the spring with two successive festivals, attested at *Athens*, for example, by the month names *Elaphêboliôn* = March and *Munichion* = April.²⁸ *Dionysus* too has a festival in spring, the one that celebrates the opening of the new wine. Although at *Athens* it is as early as the eponymous *Anthesteîrioên* = February, in other *Ionian* cities it typically falls as late as March, like the *Dionysia* instituted at *Athens* for the sake of playgoing.²⁹ At the new-wine festival the god himself, now mature and bearded, arrives among his worshippers from overseas. To invigorate him further, just before the jars are opened, he is mated with a reigning beauty like *Athens's basilinna* (*Arist. Ath.* 3.5, etc.).³⁰ The *basilinna* enjoys this distinction because the *basileus* has charge of the civic stores of wine, a detail reflected in some aetiologies.³¹ So it is that the stories both of *Theseus* and of young love at *Patrae* find their commemoration at two spring festivals occurring close together, a festival of *Artemis* and another of *Dionysus*. After *Ariadne's*

prenuptial experience with Theseus or else with the literal boy, she becomes the destined bride of Dionysus as he arrives in triumph from overseas. At Patrae the guilty liaison is finally expiated when Dionysus' image is likewise brought from overseas.

6. At Athens, miniature vessels of a distinctive shape and decoration are commonly dedicated in several cults of Artemis at Munichia and Brauron and elsewhere. The label generally applied to them is *krateriskos* < *krater* "mixing bowl" for wine.³² It is not suggested, it could not be, that Artemis and her worshippers have any use for such an article; this has come to be a generic designation of a miniature vessel. The effect, however, is to stifle any thought of what they actually are.³³ The shape is quite distinctive: a wide bowl with opposed loop handles and a high flaring foot.³⁴ It is a *lebes gamikos*, a water basin for a bridal bath.³⁵ On one of them a full-size vessel is shown being tipped over so as to pour out the water—it has served its purpose (Brauron A 56 / 564).³⁶ On one of them a full-size vessel is in fact represented by fragments found at both Munichia and Brauron.³⁷ Since the little girls called Bears are often represented on the miniature copies, it may be that copies were dedicated at this stage in token of a later use (the little Bears occur only at Athens as a democratic innovation). The later use, a bridal bath, can only belong to the ritual of the bedchamber, itself a magic prelude to the actual wedding.

7. A painted scene on a red-figure kalyx krater, c. 440–430 B.C., is also suggestive (Basel, Cahn Coll. 501–6). On one side we see the family group of Leto, Artemis, and Apollo, and on the other side, on two separate fragments, two figures wearing bear masks: a woman dressed in robe and mantle, with hands upraised as in worship, and a much shorter naked male, a boy it must be, beside a laurel tree, perhaps leaning on a rock. The two figures are undoubtedly officiants at a shrine of Artemis, but whereas the woman must be a Bear priestess, the boy has not been explained.³⁸ A ready explanation is that he partners the bride in the bedchamber. We shall come back to the vase apropos of the Bear priestess.

The New Bride

Such is the ritual of the bedchamber for the bride-to-be. The second occasion is for the new bride after marriage (lines 91–96). She comes down to the brideplace to make a special offering. She does so *ὅποκα κα δήληται Ἀρταμιτίοις* "whenever she wishes at a festival of Artemis—but the sooner the better." If remiss, she still does so *τοῖς[Ἀρταμιτί]-/[οι]ς* "at that festival of Artemis." For the

second mention of the festival, the article is used as a weak demonstrative. At this festival of her choosing, she sacrifices ἄ κ[α δηλητ]αι, “whatever she wishes,” a victim of her choosing. The sacrifice is only indicated as the duty owing if she should be remiss: “if she does not come down, she shall discharge the sacrifice to Artemis anyway, of whatever victim she wishes at that festival of Artemis.” If the new bride is remiss, the penalty is as usual to purify the shrine and sacrifice a full-grown animal.

As to the festival, we need to settle a question of meaning. Artemis has more than one festival each year; three festivals were probably the rule. There are the two in spring mentioned above, and another in summer, such as the *Brauronia* of Athens.³⁹ Now one of these festivals sometimes has the name *Artamitia* or *Artemisia*, whence the month name *Artamitios* or *Artemision*. But *Artamitia* or *Artemisia* may also refer to any festival of Artemis, whatever its individual name. *Apollonia*, *Aphrodisia*, and the like have the same two senses. If the *Artamitia* here mentioned were a particular festival, the time allowed—“the sooner the better”—would be a number of years. This is quite unlikely, especially as a further occasion arises with the conception of a child. Since a woman may be joined in marriage at any time of year, there is reason to give her a choice of festivals within the year, while saying also “the sooner the better.” The festival of Artemis is therefore any festival within the year.

As to the sacrificial victim, what latitude is actually given? It cannot be other than a customary animal, probably a she-goat, the usual choice for Artemis. At Munichia and Brauron, as we shall see, a she-goat is sacrificed in the ritual associated with the Bear priestess. The neuter plural pronoun need not mean that she must or may sacrifice more than one victim; it is used rather of different possibilities. Most likely, the new bride is called upon to seek out an animal of robust health and fine appearance as her own tribute to the goddess.

It is a custom then for a new bride, *nympha*, to attend a festival that she chooses and to sacrifice an animal that she chooses. A custom of the simplest. Yet it gives a festival of Artemis, any festival of hers, an extraordinary character. The festival attendance will be composed of many new brides. Even if other women are present in strength, the new brides will stand out by reason of the sacrifice each of them offers as a personal matter. They are a band of *nymphai* honoring their goddess: the very scene that typifies so many myths of Artemis.

The myths, it is true, portray the *nymphai* as fierce determined virgins and likewise their goddess. This portrayal of both is belied by everything we know otherwise: by the cult of Artemis *in toto*, and by the very word *nymphē* meaning “bride,” by every local *Nymphē* whom

young mothers adore, by many a storied *nymphē* who consorts with Hermes or Pan or any amorous male.⁴⁰ Now one of these festivals sometimes has the name *Artamitia* or *Artemisia*, whence the month name *Artamitios* or *Artemision*. But *Artamitia* or *Artemisia* may also refer to any festival of Artemis impose a peculiar view of *nymphai* as companions of the goddess, the *nymphai* of her myths. Our inscription, having shown that festivals of Artemis are indeed gatherings of literal *nymphai* “brides,” gives no further help. We must look elsewhere.

1. Thessaly and the Thessalian enclave at Lete in Macedonia have produced a number of dedications by or in favor of young women in

which they are registered as *νεβεύσασα / νεβεύσανσα*, also *ἀρχινεύσασα, ἐπινεύσασα*.⁴¹ Those of Thessaly are always addressed to Artemis, most often with the epithet *throsiā*; those of Lete perhaps derive from a joint sanctuary of Demeter and other women’s goddesses, but one is suitably addressed to *kala thea*, recalling Artemis’ epithet *kalliste*. The verbs *νεύω* and *νεβεύω* can only be formed from *νέος* and *νέφος*, *ς* being demonstrated by Linear B and Cypriot.⁴² The young women somehow performed as *νέαι*, “new” ones or “young” ones in the cult of Artemis.

They are likely to be new brides, not a female age-class undergoing initiation.⁴³ At Larisa,, a woman’s husband makes the dedication, naming also her father—both are scions of leading families.⁴⁴ The dedication is offered as *lytra* “ransom.” At Atrax, a dedication to Artemis *throsia* is offered as *teleūma* “fulfillment,” and at Phalanna, a dedication to Demeter and Kore as *teleiuma* “fulfillment”

(these women however are not labeled with the *νεύω / νεβεύω* participles).⁴⁵ Both ransom and fulfillment suit a new bride better than a maiden.⁴⁶

2. Herodotus tells how “the women of Athens” were celebrating a festival of Artemis at Brauron when the Pelasgians carried off a number of them to be concubines, and how these women afterwards bore sons who even as little boys were so sturdy and bold that the Pelasgians out of fear killed every mother and child (6. 138–139.1). This shocking tale turns on the nature of the festival: the women were new brides ready to bear sons. It follows on another Pelasgian story almost as shocking, which likewise matches an Athenian custom. The Pelasgians were expelled from Attica for lewd and violent behavior—they not only assaulted maidens drawing water at the Ilissus spring but even plotted to kill Athenians (6.137). It is an aetiology of the *Palladion* shrine of Athena and the *Palladion* court that tried cases of nefarious plotting. Both offenses are depicted on the temple frieze—we see Pelasgians assaulting maidens right beside the shrine and Pelasgians condemned to exile as the penalty for plotting (they stand

beside their baggage).⁴⁷

Stories of this kind, heaping reproach on the native inhabitants of Lemnos, probably began with Athens' conquest of the island in c. 510 b.c.⁴⁸ By Herodotus' time they were gospel and linked with proud Athenian institutions, the *Palladion* shrine and the summer festival of Brauron. At the festival, women pray for splendid sons; the story shows that their prayers are always answered. Long after, Philochorus gives a variant account of the raid on Brauron, with maidens as a more conventional target (*FGrH* 328 F 100–1).⁴⁹ This should not lead us to suppose that maidens alternated with brides in the fifth-century story.⁵⁰

3. A gloss of Hesychius introduces another form of ritual, a foot-race of young women.

νέαι ἀγωνισάμεναι γυναῖκες τὸν ἱερὸν δρόμον.⁵¹ Being defined as “women,” these “new” ones must be new brides, like those of Thessaly. The gloss no doubt pertains to a particular city or region that we cannot identify (unless it is Attica, to be mentioned next). Sparta is renowned for the footraces, as for other exercises, of its maidens, not its women, and at Olympia maidens, not women, race in a fourth-yearly festival of Hera.⁵² Since the Spartan custom is often exalted as the ideal preparation for marriage and childbearing, it cannot be that new brides competed as well without our knowing it. Hesychius refers to quite a different custom signaled by the express term *γυναῖκες*.

4. The miniature vessels of Athenian cult, little basins rather than *krateriskoi*, show girls of different ages variously active but especially running. Though we never suspected it, races are shown to be a usual activity of girls who resort to a sanctuary of Artemis. The girls so depicted may be quite small, or older but prepubescent, or distinctly pubescent, and there are a few who might be fully developed—young women rather than girls.⁵³ It is hard to be sure how old they are unless they are naked, and nakedness instead of chiton dress seems reserved for those of intermediate age.

The little girls, the most numerous, are surely the Bears of age five to ten. The eldest of these are shown naked, and so are others older still, around puberty. Those above ten need not be the Bears, who are a well-attested age group, as we shall see; they may be worshippers without title. It is clear in any case that many different races were run by girls of different ages—it would not be a race at all unless restricted to a narrow age group (much narrower, say, than age five to ten). Now the bridal basin evoked by all the votive copies has no proper use but for a bride; girls can only imagine a bridal bath or play at it. A race is likewise proper to brides, witness Hesychius. We may suppose that girls only play at it, full of happy expectation.

5. The *nymphēion* “bride place” as the festival location is not heard of otherwise with reference to the cult of Artemis. It merely reminds us of all those mythical scenes in which the “nymphs” of Artemis gather round the goddess so as to rest and bathe when they have enough of hunting. The hunting, however, is mostly described as running through the wild, and this is the activity we have just ascribed to new brides. Bathing too is evident from the miniature basins. Now Brauron is known not only for running and bathing but also, as it curiously happens, for τὸ ἱερὸν κυνηγῶσιον “the sacred hunting place.” The defendant Hierocles, when accused of stealing votive garments, said that he was only bringing them on the orders of the priestess to the place so called (hyp. [Dem.] 25 *Aristog.* 1). A “sacred *kynegesion*” is not likely to be a room or any interior element of a building. It may be the counterpart at Brauron of the *nymphēion* at Cyrene, i.e. the sanctuary area where new brides conduct themselves so as to inspire the mythical scenes.

The new bride sacrifices at the *nymphēion* on the second occasion and, as we are about to see, returns to the *nymphēion* on the third occasion so as to retrieve the animal hide and present it to the Bear priestess. The ritual is analogous not only to the myths of Artemis depicting her band of nymphs but also to the myths of Artemis that involve a fated bride or nymph and the slaying of a wild animal, most notably the myths of Iphigeneia and Callisto.

The Expectant Mother

“[A bride, when pregnant, before giving birth] shall go down to the bride place to Artemis.” And again, “if she does not come down before giving birth,” there is a penalty. The exact purport of *πρὶν τεκέν* “before giving birth” was self-evident to those who framed the rule, but we must hesitate. Is it while pregnant, any time during her term, or before delivery, when her term is nearly complete? If the former, the woman may perhaps comply when she grows anxious, or at the soonest, before all the dangers of pregnancy. If the latter, she must judge when her term is nearly complete, but she will be intent upon it anyway. The latter is meant beyond a doubt. The rule goes on to say that the woman shall keep pure during certain days round the time of the visit to the bride place. Furthermore, the woman who does not visit the bride place shall keep pure on the same days—keeping pure is even more important than the visit. But this woman who does not visit the bride place would not know which days are meant unless they were determined by the impending birth. Nor could she be referred to as one who does not visit the bride place, unless a definite time had passed.

Even so, even though the third occasion is for a woman close to giving birth, it will sometimes follow soon after the second occasion, a sacrifice by the new bride. Indeed it will often follow sooner rather than later; man and wife often hope for a child without delay. A new bride may conceive in short order and become aware of it, even at the time of that festival of Artemis. The very next festival after she marries will take place within about half a year at most, but for one reason or another she may not choose the very next festival; it is only said, “the sooner the better.”

“[She herself] shall give to the Bear feet and the head and the skin.” The pronoun *αὐτά* “she herself” must be supplied within a small lacuna; it is not quite certain and hardly matters. This is the woman’s tribute to the Bear priestess. The pronoun makes it obvious that she takes up the parts in her hands and presents them—but she will do so in any case. Now feet and head and skin are the very outline of the animal’s form; they reconstitute the victim. Probably the animal was flayed so that feet and head remained attached. However assembled, feet, head, and skin are not like the perquisites normally awarded to a priest or priestess. Such perquisites are edible or serviceable parts of the animal, each of which has its own value; the staple, indeed proverbial, perquisites are skin and thigh together, useful and nourishing respectively.⁵⁴ Head or feet or both may be awarded, likewise the skin, but any of these with other parts as well.⁵⁵ The combination of feet, head, and skin can only be the reconstituted animal, a magical notion.

“If she does not come down before giving birth, she shall go down with an animal full grown.” Is this what she should have done anyway, sacrifice a fullgrown animal so as to present those parts to the Bear? It would be odd if the rule mentioned first only the presenting, and then only the sacrificing. To sacrifice a full-grown animal is the almost invariable penalty and is likely to be so here. A woman who has given birth does not perform the same rite as one before delivery, because the need for it has passed; she only pays a penalty.

Nor should we assume that an animal is sacrificed just before the parts are presented to the Bear. No sort of victim is prescribed, and none can be inferred from the context. But the victim sacrificed by a new bride at that festival of Artemis was remarkable; it was an animal she chose for herself. The chosen animal deserves this treatment of being reconstituted in outline and presented to the Bear. After the festival, feet, head, and hide are preserved in the sanctuary until needed for the following occasion. It is hoped that the time between will not be long.

The Bear priestess is known from other inscriptions of Cyrene.

Each year the accounts of the *damiergoi* record an expenditure ἄρκῳ τροφᾷ Ἀρτάμιτι καταγωγίδι ἐς τὰ ἱερά “for maintenance of the Bear, for the sake of the rites of Artemis *katagogis*.”⁵⁶ The Bear is lodged at the sanctuary at certain times throughout the year. Her schedule can be inferred from the rule of purity we are about to see.

Four lines are devoted to this visit to the sanctuary; another four and a half are devoted to the woman’s purity. “She who goes down shall keep pure (ἀγνευσεο) on the seventh and the eighth and the ninth.” Equally so “she who does not come down.” The present participle κατίασσα and the perfect μὴ κατεληλευθῆα refer to the same definite occasion, a visit shortly before delivery. It was said likewise of the bride-to-be just before the wedding, “she shall not pollute herself” (οὐδὲ μiasεῖ). In both cases the meaning is to abstain from sexual intercourse. In both the penalty is the same (or rather, in the first case, only if she pollutes herself voluntarily), to purify the shrine and sacrifice an animal full grown.

What days are these, “the seventh and the eighth and the ninth”? Days so numbered are naturally taken as days of the month.⁵⁷ The Bear is lodged at the sanctuary at certain times throughout the year. Her schedule can be inferred from the rule of purity we are about to see.

Four lines are devoted to this visit to the sanctuary; another four and a half are devoted to the woman’s purity. “She who goes down shall keep pure (*ayvevaei*) on the seventh and the eighth and the ninth.” Equally so “she who does not come down.” The present participle *Karlaaaa* and the perfect *pC Kare`~evdv~ia* refer to the same definite occasion, a visit shortly before delivery. It was said likewise of the bride-to-be just before the wedding, “she shall not pollute herself” (*oiSè piaael*). In both cases the meaning is to abstain from sexual intercourse. In both the penalty is the day before, the sixth day of the month, that is the holy day of Artemis.⁵⁸ Among all the days of a monthly decad, from the first to the ninth, that belong by repute to one deity or another, this sixth day of Artemis is arguably the most ancient and meaningful. It is true that the sixth and the seventh days belong to her and to Apollo respectively. Both days are renowned in virtue of their twinship—it is said that Leto bore them a day apart, and Artemis precociously helped to deliver her brother. But despite the story of the twin birth, these two deities are not in fact closely related either in cult or in myth. And there is good reason to regard Apollo as a latecomer to the pantheon and his festival series of spring and summer as a deliberate creation, each festival a community reunion for some practical purpose.⁵⁹ Throughout the season he was assigned a general function, fostering young men, that matched the role of

Artemis as goddess of women—and he was also assigned a holy day next to hers in the newly propagated calendars.

The sixteenth of the month is another sixth, another day for remembering Artemis; Athens' festival *Munichia* falls on the sixteenth of the like-named month. The Greeks divide the month into three decads of days, the third decad being of variable length, and the first two decads follow the same forward count, and most festivals of old custom fall on just these days.⁶⁰ Now the moon displays its utmost power between the sixth and the sixteenth days. The sixth is the earliest possible day when a distinct half moon may be seen (recognition of the sliver that is a new moon is often delayed), and the sixteenth is the last possible day when the moon may be seen at its fullest. Since Artemis is goddess of women, and women's life is governed by the moon, the two days are chosen for her festivals.

If a woman is told to keep pure on the seventh and the eighth and the ninth, it is very likely taken for granted that she will do so on the sixth—all these days may belong to either the first or the second decad. And it is very likely taken for granted that any visit to the bride-place will be made on the sixth or the sixteenth. Not to say so may seem surprising in a set of rules otherwise explicit. But the authorities who framed the rules were often enunciating old custom that was second nature to every true Cyrenaean; this is obvious in the tithing rules and suggests that the tithing rules and the rites of Artemis are now extended to others. The authorities might well forget to mention such a basic matter. Furthermore, the new bride has already offered sacrifice on either the sixth or the sixteenth of the month, though the day is left unspoken—it is the day for any festival of Artemis, just when she offers sacrifice. The present occasion, offering the hide to the Bear priestess, is coordinate with that sacrifice. On reflection, another point needs to be added. Perhaps the prenuptial rite of sleeping with a boy was also for the sixth or the sixteenth, as one chose.

The upshot is that a woman must keep pure during four days, either the sixth through the ninth or the sixteenth through the nineteenth, before the time she expects to be delivered.⁶¹ On the first of them, either the sixth or the sixteenth, she goes down to the sanctuary so as to take up the feet, head, and skin of the animal previously sacrificed and to present them to the Bear priestess.

After this third occasion, the inscription says no more about rites of Artemis, neither in the ensuing lines about miscarriage nor in the lines about childbirth near the beginning. There seems to be no rite of comparable importance after the delivery of the child. In general, we hear of dedications and not of ritual. At Brauron, by far the best-known sanctuary of Artemis, the form of dedication most amply

attested is of clothing that was evidently woven by a woman during pregnancy and dedicated after childbirth. Some items are described as “half-woven.”⁶² Perhaps the woman had got no further at the time she was delivered and was bound to offer the item as it stood then. The clothing she weaves while pregnant attests her procreative power and makes a fitting tribute.

A votive relief from Echinus in Malis, c. 300 b.c., probably depicts a thank-offering for a safe delivery.⁶³ A very small baby is presented to Artemis in her sanctuary, where some dedicated clothes happen to be displayed. The proud mother stands in an attitude of prayer, while servants bring cakes and fruit and prepare to sacrifice a goat, as it must be. At Brauron some of the votive statues representing children, unpublished, may be in token of a safe delivery—the children are sometimes very young.

What then have we learned about the ritual prior to childbirth? Why does a woman sacrifice an animal of her choice on the second occasion and present the hide to the Bear priestess on the third occasion? And why the final rule of purity? Since the sacrifice is made at a festival, it draws the goddess’s attention when she is undoubtedly present but directs it to this woman alone. Perhaps, besides being her choice, the animal is somehow marked as hers. The Athenian evidence we are about to survey includes an *aition* of the cult at Munichia in which a sacrificial goat is dressed in a woman’s clothing to give the appearance that the woman is being sacrificed. Behind the surreptitious trick there may be an actual practice of adorning a victim with some proprietary article. Afterward, the feet, head, and skin are left at the sanctuary. When the woman has conceived and carried the child almost to term, she returns to the sanctuary and gives the animal remnant to the Bear priestess, showing that the time has come for delivery.

This third occasion is evoked in a story about the Bear priestess at Munichia, to be examined below. The story turns on a declaration that a woman is pregnant, using the term *εμβαρος*. It is a term used by Menander, who often spoke of pregnancy. Now according to a scholiast on Theocritus, Menander showed how “women becoming pregnant (*κυῖσκούσαι*) call upon Artemis to beg forgiveness for having been deflowered” (*Id.* 2.66–68b = fr. 38 K-A). More likely, he showed women, or a particular woman, calling upon Artemis for help in childbirth.⁶⁴ In Terence’s play *Woman of Andros* a woman in her birth pangs calls on the Roman equivalent of Artemis (line 473), and we are told that in Menander it was in fact Artemis. Editors assign the notice of the scholiast to Menander’s *Woman of Andros*. But if “becoming pregnant” is accurate—it may not be—Menander spoke of an earlier stage, such as the encounter with the Bear priestess, which

is elsewhere implied by his term *ἔμβαρος*.

The evidence for the Bear priestess needs to be compiled apart from the occasion. She embodies a magical belief occurring all round the world, that the bear is an uncanny being of enormous power, to be solicited as an ally. It is an ally especially for women. Beyond all other animals it is strong and sure in motherhood. At the same time it is impatient of the male, now useless or worse. A woman about to be delivered associates herself with the bear and keeps pure in doing so.

The Bear Priestess

For other evidence of the Bear priestess we must resort to Athens and Attica, as so often. This figure was however to be found in many cults of Artemis. The entry *ἄρκος* in Hesychius gives the meaning *καὶ ἰέρεια τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος* after several others. It is likely enough that the original version mentioned certain places where this was true; it is not so likely that Cyrene alone has dropped out. The old story of Callisto deserves a mention at this point.⁶⁵ Though not recognizably a priestess, she is a favorite of Artemis, a “nymph” preferred above all the others—who is transformed into a bear. Zeus takes her so as to beget *Arkas* eponym of the *Arkades*, the bear ancestor of the bear people. It is necessary that Callisto be transformed into a bear before she gives birth to the bear ancestor. This may be effected by Artemis in a burst of anger after Callisto disrobes to bathe and reveals her condition. Or Zeus may be responsible in furtherance of his purpose; Euripides alludes to a happy mating in bear form, which surely belongs to them both (*Hel.* 375–80).⁶⁶ With any such details, we have a just-so story of the Bear priestess and another of the bear people, neatly combined. It is a strong indication that the office of Bear priestess was widespread. Otherwise, a whole race of bear people could not be thus explained.⁶⁷

I. We are drawn to Attica by another old story, by a variation thereof. An ideal young woman, Iphigeneia, is about to be married to an ideal young man, Achilles, but is chosen instead to be sacrificed to Artemis, the expiation she requires for a deer shot in the hunt. Just in time, it is often said, an animal was substituted at the altar through Artemis’ intervention, and it is usually said as well that Iphigeneia was installed somewhere as priestess of Artemis. The story is plainly an aetiology of ritual, of a certain sacrifice and a certain kind of priestess. The sacrificial animal was no doubt a goat; it was not a deer, even if the story gives us yet another member of the species. Phanodemus, the Attic chronicler, made it a bear (*FGrH* 325 F 14a). According to a parallel report, he spoke likewise of Iphigeneia turning into a bear (*F*

14b). He undoubtedly refers to the famous cult of Artemis at Brauron, with the festival *Brauronia*, and he means respectively a goat sacrifice and a Bear priestess.⁶⁸ Phanodemus is a good witness to Attic ritual, for he was active beside Lycurgus in reviving traditional forms during the 330s and 320s.⁶⁹ He tells us only a little more than what we know anyway, since a literal goat sacrifice is attested for the *Brauronia* (Hsch. s. *Βραυρωνίως*), and since the little Bears as an Athenian institution belong to this festival—the little Bears take their name from some more customary Bear, who can only be the Bear priestess. It has been plausibly inferred that Phanodemus situated the muster of the Greek fleet at Brauron rather than at Aulis.⁷⁰ Conversely, we infer that the most famous of all Greek myths has to do with a goat sacrifice and a Bear priestess at Aulis. There are faint traces of other efforts to attach the story to still other local cults.⁷¹

The setting at Brauron is comparable to the setting at Cyrene. Iphigeneia in Euripides is translated to the site so as to “serve as priestess round the holy stairs,” *ἀμφὶ σεμνὰς . . . κλίμακας . . . κληιδουχέϊν* (Iph. Taur. 1462–63).⁷² They can now be recognized in the steps along the north side of the temple platform, the highest part of the sanctuary.⁷³ At the northwest corner, platform and stairs overlook the sacred spring, best known for its trove of offerings but a ready source, like Cyrene’s springs, for any ritual use of water, including a bridal bath. At Cyrene the Bear priestess is perhaps lodged in the temple *adyton*. At Brauron Iphigeneia is located by Euripides close to the temple with its *adyton* and close as well to the small building fitted into the cleft, perhaps a separate *adyton*.

2. The Bear priestess may be depicted in the red-figure scene already mentioned, c. 440–430 b.c. (Basel, Cahn Coll. 501–6). A woman standing frontally wears necklace, robe, and mantle—and, covering just her head or face, a bear mask with furry outline and pointed ear.⁷⁴ On another fragment a smaller naked male wears a furrier mask over both his head and neck, as seen in profile.⁷⁵ The different masks will represent the male and the female of the species. Perhaps (it was suggested above) we see the boy who goes to bed with the bride-to-be; he might don a mask before or after this. Whatever role he played, and it was obviously magical, there can be little doubt that both are officiants wearing masks, not Callisto and Arcas turning into bears together. The woman at least can only be the Bear priestess. The palm tree evokes Brauron rather than any other Attic shrine of Artemis.

3. The Bear priestess is the subject of a story already mentioned about Artemis’ cult at Munichia, even though she is not expressly named.⁷⁶ Both this story and another story about the cult at Brauron

begin with a bear shot dead and an ensuing plague. At Brauron the remedy is to institute the service of the little Bears, expressly named—and the Bear service is said to be instituted by an Athenian decree, which happens to be the fact of the matter. This is hardly a story at all; it is no more than a perfunctory variation upon the earlier story of the cult at Munichia. We come to the little Bears below.

Even the Munichia story does not appear in any ancient source except the lexicon of Pausanias the Atticist, of the early second century A.d.⁷⁷ It is a clever story of its kind. It explains the cult at Munichia as originating in a trick perpetrated by one *Embaros*, the subject of the entry in Pausanias' lexicon. More exactly, it explains the *hierosyne* "priesthood," i.e. the office of Bear priestess, as so originating. That it is a *Bear* priestess is plainly indicated by the derivative story at Brauron. Here the bear shot dead is commemorated by the Little Bears; the like commemoration at Munichia will be a Bear priestess. (The bear shot dead at Munichia is itself a variant of the deer shot dead by Agamemnon, likewise commemorated by a priesthood, that of Iphigeneia.)

The sanctuary of Artemis on the hill Munichia was a principal civic cult even in early days, since the priesthood is said to be a hereditary one belonging to a *genos* we cannot identify.⁷⁸ The story shows us how ancient the cult is. Munichia was once an island, *Peiraeus* being named for the "crossing" by sea (cf. Str. 1.3.18, p. 58, Plin. *HN* 2.87, 201).⁷⁹ *Munichos*, the first to reach the projecting summit, founded the sanctuary, "and when a bear came to it," scil. by swimming as bears do, "and was killed by the Athenians, a plague occurred, for which Apollo foretold an end if someone should sacrifice his daughter to Artemis." Erechtheus, we recall, gave Athens a proud example of sacrificing one's daughter. The present case is more like comedy than tragedy, for a certain *Embaros* is a sly and artful man who contracts to sacrifice his daughter in return for the hereditary priesthood, but only pretends to do so while devising a curious form of ritual. The daughter is dressed in finery and is hidden in the *adyton*, and a goat is dressed in finery so as to resemble her and is sacrificed in her place.⁸⁰

It is noteworthy that the story speaks only of "the daughter," repeating the word several times. Pathos would be better served if we heard of "the child," "the girl," "the maiden," any of the words for an unmarried daughter. But they are all avoided. Now the Bear priestess will be a daughter of the *genos* member whose entitlement this is but probably not a maiden daughter. In this respect the story gives us a faithful rendering of a Bear priestess recruited from a *genos*. And it shows her "hidden" in an *adyton*, the lodging we conjectured for the priestess at Cyrene and at Brauron.

Most strikingly of all, she is equated with the sacrificial goat—both are dressed in a woman’s finery, as if this were a clever ruse. At Cyrene a new bride sacrifices an animal of her own choosing, presumably a goat; it may even be that the animal was marked as hers with some article of woman’s clothing. In any case, the feet, head and skin of the animal are put by at the sanctuary until the woman is delivered of her first child; then she presents them to the Bear priestess. At Brauron “a festival is conducted for Artemis *Brauronia* and a goat is sacrificed” (Hesychius s. *Βραυρωνίους*); a sacrificial goat is also depicted in a votive relief found at the site (Brauron 1153).⁸¹

It is noteworthy that the story speaks only of “the daughter,” repeating the word several times. Pathos would be better served if we heard of “the child,” “the girl,” “the maiden,” any of the words for an unmarried daughter. But they are all avoided. Now the Bear priestess will be a daughter of the *genos* member whose entitlement this is but probably not a maiden daughter. In this respect the story gives us a faithful rendering of a Bear priestess recruited from a *genos*. And it shows her “hidden” in an *adyton*, the lodging we conjectured for the priestess at Cyrene and at Brauron.

Most strikingly of all, she is equated with the sacrificial goat—both are dressed in a woman’s finery, as if this were a clever ruse. At Cyrene a new bride sacrifices an animal of her own choosing, presumably a goat; it may even be that the animal was marked as hers with some article of woman’s clothing. In any case, the feet, head and skin of the animal are put by at the sanctuary until the woman is delivered of her first child; then she presents them to the Bear priestess. At Brauron “a festival is conducted for Artemis *Brauronia* and a goat is sacrificed at both Munichia and Brauron, and at Brauron it is during a festival, and at Cyrene a festival is the occasion for a new bride to offer sacrifice to Artemis.

The clever ruse of the story conveys the same sense as the ritual, equating the sacrificial animal with the Bear priestess. In the story, a woman’s finery is so to speak another term in the equation. And so it is in the ritual of Artemis. A woman before giving birth offers up the animal parts to the Bear priestess and after giving birth offers up the clothing she has woven to the goddess.⁸² Woman, goat, bear, priestess, goddess—they are all one in magic thinking.

A Woman’s First Pregnancy

The ritual is concerned with childbirth, and so is the story of “*Embaros*” at Munichia. The story makes this a name and alleges that

it is used as a proverb. There is no such name and no such proverb.

The word *ἐμβαρὸς* means “pregnant” and was used in the ritual, doubtless as a second-person question, perhaps also as a first-person affirmation. The meaning and the use give rise to the original story. They are however completely obscured in Pausanias’ lexicon, at least as reconstructed from scattered remnants, as also in Photius’ lexicon and in all derivative lexica and scholia. Instead, *ἐμβαρὸς* is said to mean “clever” and to be proverbially used as a first or second-person affirmation, “I am / you are *embaros*,” because of the person *Embaros* and his clever ruse. The consequences are that *ἐμβαρὸς* “of weighty sense” and *Ἐμβαρὸς* “a proverbially cunning hero” have entered our authoritative Greek dictionary (respectively *LSJ*, *LSJ Rev. Suppl.* s.v.) and that *Baridae* or *Embaridae* is conjectured to be the name of the Athenian *genos* who have charge of the cult of Artemis at Munichia (so H. Diels).⁸³ This tralatitian lore must now yield to a few simple facts.

The word *ἐμβαρὸς* is a compound of *ν* + *βαρος*, perhaps formed by analogy with *ἐγκυος* and *ἐγκύμων*, and *ἐμβαρὸι*.⁸⁴ The expected meaning, “pregnant,” is attested by a Latin glossary *ἐμβαρὸς* gravidae = *LSJ* s. *ἐμβαρὸς* II). Pausanias gives “*Baros*” as a variant of the name, without any further detail; most likely, *βαρος* served as a reduced form with the same meaning. Pausanias and Photius both cite literary instances of the word; they both cite Menander. Menander, of the genre New Comedy, often speaks of pregnancy, the unintended pregnancy of lovely young women.

In Menander’s *Rhaphizomene*, as quoted by Photius (s. *ἐμβαρὸς* Men. fr. 330 K-A), someone says first *οὐκ ἐμβαρὸς εἶ*.⁸⁵ Editors take this as a name and as a statement addressed to a man: “you are not *Embaros*.” It is more likely a question addressed to a woman: “are you not *enceinte*?” Someone else replies *ἐμβαρὸς; ἀρχαῖσμός οὗτος ῥημάτων*. “*Enceintes* Here’s a quaint old-fashioned way of speaking.” The reply seems evasive, and pert and wily.

Pausanias offers no quotation, only the reference “Menander in *Phasma*.” The reference can now be recognized in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus containing four partial columns of *Phasma* (POxy 2825 = *Phasma* 57–107 Sandbach / 57–107, 193–207 Arnott).⁸⁶ Again we have the phrase *οὐκ ἐμβαρὸς ἐστὶ*, and again it may be a question (line 80).⁸⁷ “Is she not *enceintes* I myself suspected as much right away.” It probably refers to a woman, since there is mention just before of *τὸ παιδίον* “the girl” (line 79), and we hear next and at length of the distracted speech and behavior of a young lover (lines

The story line will also serve to guide us. Though *Phasma* is summarized by Donatus as the love and marriage of a boy and girl whom the boy first took for *aphasma* (*ad Ter. Eun. prolog. 9.3*), it is clear that there was much more to it. In a later column someone asks “who dishonors [“o, and a woman admonishes a man or boy about a “poor girl” who was “at Brauron, at the *Brauronia*,” “during a *pannychis* and dances,” who was on the “road,” who was “wandering” (lines 93–107 Sandbach / 193–207 Arnott). These are usual antecedents of unintended pregnancy.

The question then takes two forms, οὐκ ἔμβαρος εἶ “are you not *enceinte*” or οὐκ ἔμβαρος ἐστὶ “is she not *enceinte*” and the word is mocked as oldfashioned. We infer from Pausanias’ story that the ritual of Artemis accounts for it. It is not hard to guess how. Perhaps, when a woman came to the Bear priestess to render up feet, head, and skin, the priestess thus addressed her, “art thou not teeming?” or thus exclaimed, “is she not teeming!” Perhaps the woman also gave a due reply, ἔμβαρός εἰμι “I am teeming.” But the first-person form may be doubted. Pausanias employs the second-person form to round off the story as a supposed proverb. The words so used might be either an admiring affirmation or, with a negative, an admiring question to be answered in the affirmative. Hence the preposterous meaning “clever.” Pausanias begins with the first-person form, but it is hardly suitable for a proverb—as a grammarian, he may be only conjugating. Nor is it very likely that a firstperson form would be echoed in literature and excerpted by a commentator. We can be sure that a question was asked of or about the woman, or else a statement was made about her, but not that she spoke for herself.

In sum, the story of *Embaros* is a late compendious aetiology of the cult at Munichia that starts from the phrase “you are *embaros*” (or the like), as excerpted from Menander by commentators. (It is quite possible that there were no other instances of the word in literature save the two we have, in *Rhapizomene* and *Phasma*.) In the ritual of Artemis, the phrase was addressed to a pregnant woman; so it was in the dramatic action, but with wry humor, conformably with the circumstances. Though the phrase properly means “you are pregnant,” the story of *Embaros* explains it jokingly, as meaning “you are clever.” Note, however, that the phrase would lend itself to the joke anyway, if one woman ever bantered another. And then the story would explain a customary joke, as well as the ritual.

However this may be, the proper meaning was certainly known to the author of the story, for he knows all the details of Artemis’ ritual, and his whole story is a joke—it is a parody of the story of Erechtheus

and even more of the story of Iphigeneia, which begins with the killing of a deer and ends with a priestess installed at some shrine of Artemis. The ritual details incorporated in the joke are that a goat is sacrificed by a new bride, that a Bear priestess is lodged in the *adyton*, that the remnants of the goat sacrifice are presented to this priestess, that the phrase “you are *embaros*” is pronounced at the culminating moment, and that a woman dedicates the clothing she has woven during pregnancy.

Most myths are aetiological in origin; it is in the nature of storytelling to explain. But only a myth concocted by a grammarian could provide such an exhaustive explanation.

The Little Bears

We have reviewed the limited evidence, mostly Athenian, for the Bear priestess. Athens also has the novel institution of the little Bears, which is much more fully reported. In recent work the whole range of evidence is obscured by presuppositions about initiation rites. The priestess may be forgotten, or priestess and little ones may be merged as an adolescent figure. We cannot omit to consider the little Bears and to settle the question of their origin and nature.

The little Bears are between ages five and ten and are drawn from all Athenian families. The late commentators who say so, chiefly the scholia to Aristophanes’ *Lysistrata* line 645, reproduce in bare outline the expert comment of earlier days. These numerous little girls can now be recognized on the miniature basins dedicated in several sanctuaries of Artemis. Aristophanes mentions them, and so did Lysias in a lost speech. Much later, they figure in Philochorus’ version of the Pelasgian raid on Brauron. Very much later, the late commentators give us an aetiological story about the little Bears at Brauron that only varies the story about the Bear priestess at Munichia; yet this story, like the other, is based on the facts. It tells us that the little Bears, being drawn from all Athenian families, were instituted by an Athenian decree. A decree to this effect is cited by Harpocration, apropos of Lysias’ speech, from Craterus’ *Collection of Athenian Decrees*. To be registered by Craterus, the decree was preserved on stone and can be no earlier than c. 450 b.c. The little Bears are a democratic innovation of the later fifth century. They probably did not outlast the age of the orators; Philochorus is unrealistic.

It is a clear, consistent picture. But it is not the picture presented by the proliferating discussion of the last forty years, since Brelich. The age of the Bears is much disputed; the lower limit might be ten, and the upper limit might be round puberty or even the time for marriage. To serve as a Bear will be old custom, perhaps perpetuated

as a privilege of wealthy families. In a word, it is a fine example of the fashionable category of initiation rites.

The evidence is misinterpreted, at least when it is not disregarded. Aristophanes especially is misinterpreted. The chorus of women in *Lysistrata* come forward to give advice for the city, speaking as a woman qualified to do so, “since (the city) reared me in comfort and splendor. At the age of seven, I served as *arrhêphoros* straightway; then as a ten-year-old I was *aletris* for the *Archêgetis*; and then with my *krokôtos* I was a Bear at the *Braurônia*; and I was a *kanêphoros* once, being a pretty child, with a necklace of dried figs” (lines 640–47). The woman recalls her public service, well accustomed as she is to public speaking (she would have us think so). Many modern readers naturally suppose that she recalls a graduated series of initiation rites preparing a girl for womanhood. The passage becomes an ethnological document of the first order; each step in the series is extensively debated; emendation is proposed to give a clearer sequence.⁸⁸ This is to forget that Aristophanes cared more for amusing his audience than instructing posterity. Professing a background of comfort and splendor, the woman first announces two of the rarest distinctions, being an *arrhêphoros* at age seven and an *aletris* at age ten.⁸⁹ And having suddenly exhausted her store of plausible fiction, she continues with two of the commonest things at Athens, playing at marriage as a little Bear and going in some procession or other with trumpery adornment. A resume that begins with *arrhêphoros* and *aletris* ends with a necklace of dried figs: it is the humor of incongruity. With the latter items, as she wordily prevaricates, the age does not matter, or If it is inconsequent, this is even richer.

It has not been noticed that the language and the rhythm change abruptly to mark the change of content. Lines 641–44, about being *arrhêphoros* and *aletris*, are paeonic-cretic tetrameters; lines 645–47, about being a Bear and a *kanêphoros*, are respectively a catalectic trochaic tetrameter and a trochaic trimeter + a cretic dimeter. Being *arrhêphoros* and *aletris* is recalled in words brief and pointed, “at the age of seven... straightway,” “*εἶτα* then ...as a ten-year-old.” Being a Bear and a *kanêphoros* is recalled in words vague and rambling, “*καὶ τότε*” “and then” without further mention of age, “*πότε*” “once,” “being a pretty child.” The effect is of bathetic decrescendo.

Rightly understood, Aristophanes supports the plain statement of the commentators that the institution of the little Bears is open to all Athenian families. He mentions an unfamiliar detail by the way. A Bear is imagined with a *krokôtos*, *ἔχουσα τὸν κροκωτόν*.⁹⁰ The scholia add nothing but the obvious, *κροκωτὸν ἡμφιεσμέναι* / *ἡμφιέννυντο* “they dressed in a *krokotos*”; yet this goes to show

that *χέουσα* “shedding” the *krokôtos*, a fanciful emendation, was never in the text of Aristophanes. The *krokôtos* is otherwise known, not least from Aristophanes, as a full-length yellow gown that makes a woman irresistibly alluring.⁹¹ *Krokôtoi* appear with details of workmanship in the Brauron inventories.⁹² Very likely a bride wore it at her wedding.⁹³ If a little Bear wears it, it is by anticipation, like using a bridal basin. Whether it is rendered on the miniature basins in any painted scene is hard to say.⁹⁴ But at Brauron little girls portrayed by votive statues, unpublished, wear a fulllength gown that may once have been colored yellow.⁹⁵

Lysias in his speech *On the Daughter of Phrynichus* spoke of the Bear service as a “tithing,” *δεκατεῦσαι* (Harp. s. vv. *ἀρκτεῦσαι, δεκατεύειν* = frs. 4950 Sauppe).⁹⁶ A dutiful father will both “tithe” and “initiate” his daughter, as appears from an observation of [Demosthenes] *Against Medon*, *οὐ δεκατεῦσαι ταύτην οὐδὲ μυῆσαι* “he neither tithed nor initiated her” (Harp. s. *δεκατεύειν* = fr. 7 Sauppe). It was open to anyone to be initiated, scil. in the Eleusinian Mysteries, at the cost of a few drachmas. We see that Bear service was just as commonplace. We do not see exactly why it was a tithing, but to “tithe” is simply to “consecrate” (as Didymus explains *apud* Harpocration); there is no suggestion of privilege.

Such is the firsthand evidence of literary sources. We turn to the epigraphic evidence, if Craterus’ *Collection of Athenian Decrees* may be so described. “Craterus in His *Decrees*” is cited by Harpocration for particulars of the Bear service (s. *ἀρκτεῦσαι* = FGrH 342 F 9). Harpocration is a principal source of Craterus’ fragments, including the verbatim quotation of two substantial clauses of a fifth-century decree (s. *ναυτοδίκαί* = F 4). The Bear service was therefore the subject of a decree which, like other material, Craterus copied from a *stêlē*. The *stêlē* probably stood on the Acropolis, where Craterus also drew heavily on the tribute lists and on decrees of condemnation.⁹⁷ As we well know, Artemis of Brauron was made at home on the Acropolis at just this time. A precinct with a stoa was either created or refurbished next to the magnificent Propylaea, with which it is carefully aligned; the Brauron inventories were copied out in full for display.⁹⁸ Meanwhile, Brauron itself was adorned with a large courtyard and stoa and dining rooms.⁹⁹

All at once, Artemis and her ancient customs come to the front of patriotic display at Athens.¹⁰⁰ The building initiatives are accompanied by a social program, the little Bears. The unusual, indeed unparalleled, age group of five to ten is intended to make it possible for all girls of citizen families to visit Brauron and join the ritual. General participation can be ensured only by making it a game for little girls and not some anxious competition for adolescents, in

which ordinary families will be eclipsed at once by wealthy ones. The scenes on the miniature basins show that older girls also came to Brauron but that the little girls were typical, and so was their activity. The races are most often of little girls in chitons. But one scene shows ten-year-olds, as they appear to be—i.e. the oldest of the Bears proper—running naked, while the last of them looks back to a literal bear, standing beside one of Brauron's palm trees.¹⁰¹

As was said, the decree instituting the little Bears is featured also in the late story about Brauron that varies the late story about Munichia.¹⁰² A decree that is part of a silly story seems not to deserve the respect otherwise accorded to Athenian documents.¹⁰³ But decrees are not invented as a narrative motif. Instead, the story merely embroiders the historical decree.¹⁰⁴ A bear comes to Brauron to forage, as bears will. It grows tame or at least tractable, as bears will, until "a certain maiden" teases it in play and is scratched. Whence the killing of the bear and the ensuing plague. Now the killing of the bear at Munichia was entirely conventional; it might as well have been a deer; but the killing at Brauron is a clever, realistic variation.¹⁰⁵ The remedy prescribed by an oracle is to create an institution that is somehow selfevident: the Athenians "shall compel their own maidens to do Bear service (*ἀρκτεύειν*). The Athenians in response "voted in assembly (*ἐψηφίσαντο*) that a maiden shall not cohabit with a man until she does Bear service for the goddess." The word *parthenos* "maiden," used insistently, should not deceive us; it is the standard word occurring in innumerable stories. The playing, the teasing are suited only to a little girl.

Since the institution was meant for a broad democracy, it was unlikely to survive in changed conditions. The sanctuary at Brauron was abandoned, unless for local use, as a result of flooding sometime in the third century, but the Bears had disappeared earlier. To make them the target of the Pelasgian raid, as Philochorus does, is unrealistic, doubly so. The Pelasgians as coarse lascivious scoundrels will abduct young women, not little girls. And when they strike at the moment of Brauron's festival, young women will be there in plenty.

Callimachus with rare learning gives us a rare view of the little Bears in his *Hymn to Artemis*. He makes us aware of the paradox that Artemis' main function in cult is to help women in childbirth (lines 20–22), whereas her myths are all about coursing game in the mountains. He contrives to mention many cults, including those of Cyrene and Athens (lines 206–8, 259), by interweaving them with myths. For the rest, he tells how Artemis managed to equip herself with bow, hounds, and companion nymphs (e.g. the Cyclopes manufactured a special bow, not a heavy military type but a much lighter one). The companion nymphs are of two kinds, and one kind is

perfectly familiar—twenty skilful attendants who assist her in the hunt (lines 15–17, 44–45, 162–67). The other kind we hear of nowhere else, and we may wonder what they are supposed to do. They are sixty “nine-year-old children, without belts” (lines 13–14, 42–43:

πάσας εἰνατέας, πάσας ἔτι παῖδας ἀμίτρους).¹⁰⁶ The Bears we see on the miniature basins mostly wear short chitons, without belts. The upper limit for the Bears is “nine” years, not ten, by inclusive reckoning. The total “sixty” is not a customary number; it is a large one compared with the twenty regular nymphs; it suggests the scope of Athens’ democratic institution.¹⁰⁷ Callimachus has invented a mythical *persona* for the little Bears.

No element of the worship of Artemis, least of all the Bear service of ages five to ten, is to be explained historically as a rite of initiation.¹⁰⁸ The Bear service is a creation of democratic Athens on the analogy of other ritual. In virtue of the Bear service every little girl enjoys a happy time of make-believe. She is a bear, running wildly with other bears, and she is a bride, bathing carefully at a bridal basin, dressing carefully in a yellow gown. As play, it is also magic with the promise of fulfillment. Children take to magic ritual even when it is otherwise given up.

Magic Purposes

The rites of Artemis prescribed at Cyrene agree with many indications elsewhere.¹⁰⁹ And these rules for three successive stages in the life of a bride explain much that is otherwise puzzling. The myths of Artemis only dramatize the ritual; the ritual is remarkably simple and uniform throughout the Greek world.

A bride-to-be spends a night apart, bedded with a boy, in magical anticipation of childbirth. Healthy himself, with two healthy living parents, the boy represents the hoped-for outcome. It is the magic of contact and simulation, contact with the boy and simulation of childbed. There are many stories, most famously the story of Ariadne and Theseus and Dionysus, to show that it always happened so.

The new bride attends a festival when she is ready, joining other brides so inclined. There is racing until they tire, and bathing afterward. Each makes her own offering of a goat that she has chosen. The animal hide, flayed with head and feet still attached, is left at the sanctuary to represent her. Stories to like effect are those of Iphigeneia and Callisto; many scenes of Artemis and her nymphs are to like effect.

The pregnant woman returns to the sanctuary shortly before delivery and presents the animal hide to the Bear priestess. At the same time she avoids her husband. By these means—the sacrificial

goat, the Bear priestess, the avoidance of the male—the ritual of Artemis enforces the magic likeness of bear and woman.¹¹⁰ The bear is uniquely strong and fertile and protective of its offspring.

This image of the bear is documented by prehistoric archaeology and by ethnography in every land where the bear is native, including Greece.¹¹¹ The Greeks were aware at the same time that the bear is a ferocious predator and enemy of man; other societies are aware of this at the same time; we are too; but the image remains.¹¹² And it sways persons more sophisticated than a young mother or a little girl. On page 70 of *The Economist* of March 22–28, 2008, we see a startling composite photograph of an enormous bear cradling an infant. The law firm whose advertisement this is promises to “balance aggression with delicate handling.”

1. Artemis *katagogis* figures in a recurring entry of the accounts of the *damiergoi*. Dobias-Lalou (1993, 27–28; 2000, 218) understands *katagogis* as I do. So too Gentile (1999, 335–40), who refutes at length certain other meanings that have been, or might be, proposed. The epithet is unrelated to *katagogis* as a dress or curtain that one “draws down” and to *katagogia* as rites of the wine god who “returns” or “comes to land.”

2. On the temple of Artemis see Pernier (1931, 1936), Stucchi (1975, 48–50), *Cirene* 119 (S. Ensoli and C. Parisi Presicce), 122 (Parisi Presicce).

3. Hollinshead (1985) gives a full and exact account of these temples, none of them formally published.

4. The *adyton* so understood is discussed by e.g. Kahil (1977, 95–97) and Perlman (1989, 124–27, 129–30). Hollinshead (1985, 430–39) argues, but without convincing, that the rear chamber is merely for storage and that *adyton* as a ritual term is not attached to any definite part of a building. Ekroth (2003, 93–94) agrees to some extent with Hollinshead but only for the purpose of denying that the *adyton* at Brauron served for a cult of Iphigeneia—which is most unlikely in any case.

5. This story, about the Bear priestess at Munichia, is examined below, as is a parallel story about the little Bears at Brauron. We shall see that the Bear priestess probably remained at the temple, at Cyrene or Munichia or Brauron, during the time she was available for the purpose described in our inscription.

6. Themelis (2002, 108), Ekroth (2003, 84–85). This building and the rooms within the cleft and the “sacred house” at the east are fully discussed, or to the full extent possible while the evidence is unpublished, by Ekroth (2003, 74–79, 84–87, 102–4, 108).

7. = Themelis (2002, 112–13); cf. *IG* 1³ 403–4 *inedita*.

8. Cf. Ensoli Vittozzi (1996).

9. Bathing facilities are often found in or near a sanctuary of Artemis: Ginouves (1962, 383–85), Cole (1988, 164). The ritual use is reflected by the many stories about Artemis and her nymphs as surprised at the bath: Ginouves (290–96).

10. So Stucchi (1975, 580–93), Gentile (1999, 340–41); cf. *Cirene* 118 (S. Ensoli).

11. So Chamoux (1953, 314–19), Ginouves (1962, 384–85), Parker (1983, 345), Gentile (1999, 341–42), Dobias-Lalou (2000, 308 and Plan 3). Others regard this as a secular construction, late Hellenistic or early Roman: *Cirene* 113–14 (Ensoli and Parisi Presicce).

12. Brulei (1987, 234, 277) adduces this definition—with much else, including

the Brauron inventories—as evidence of what he conceives to be a prenuptial custom of dedicating undergarments.

13. It is a very natural piece of magic. Pfeiffer on Callim. fr. 75 lines 1–3 (quoted below) cites Kagarow, Frazer, and Herter for ethnographic parallels; Pestalozza (1933, 199–200) adds a little more.

14. Nicander's tale has a woeful history of misunderstanding. Long ago, it was said to exemplify one of *Religionswissenschaft's* “obscurest problems,” “bisexual deities and the exchange of clothing between the sexes that pertains to their cult” (Nilsson [1906, 370–71], after F. Dümmler). Since then it has been claimed for the transvestite “initiation rites” that Greek cities are sometimes thought to share with tribal societies described by anthropologists. A sober recent discussion, dismissing initiation rites though accepting a change of clothes, is Forbes Irving (1990, 152–55). It is not the very latest, but there we need not go.

15. See Sporn (2002, 383–85 [table of cults of Artemis], 386 [table of cults of Leto]).

16. Sporn (2002, 217).

17. When Ovid retells the story in his own way (*Met.* 9.666–797), he substitutes Isis as an up-to-date variation: see further Robertson (2003a, 252). It is not that the real-life cult of Leto was overtaken by a cult of Isis (*pace* Sporn [2002, 200–I]). And Phaestus' cult of Leto must not be confounded with its well-documented cult of the Mother (on which see Sporn [2002, 201–2]). The epigram inscribed on a temple wall at the *Metreon* has been claimed as Orphic (fr. 568 Bernabe / 32 b iv Kern) and now as suitable for Isis. But the phrase “she mixes for the holy” advertises the Mother's characteristic rite (cf. chapter 5, note 53).

18. This story too has often been elaborately misunderstood, as by Brelich (1969, 366–77) and by many who follow him in exalting “initiation rites.” They fail to appreciate either the historical background or the literary context that we are about to see.

19. The festival of Artemis coincides with the spring festival of Dionysus, as we shall see below. As to the *Skirophoria*, see chapter 13, pp. 209–10.

20. Osanna (1993, 1996) reviews the history of the city as reflected in the acropolis cults, including that of Artemis *laphria*, who is not at issue here. The synoecism indicated by the epithet *triklaria* has been variously dated (Moggi [1976, 89–95]); Osanna argues for the early fifth century; Mylonopoulos (2003, 41) objects.

21. Callimachus spoke of Cydippe and the boy as *παρθένος* and *παῖς*. Pausanias uses the pair of terms insistently of his two lovers or of their counterparts as sacrificial victims (19.4–4, 8); only at the last does he speak of the child processioners of his own day as *τῶν ἐπιχωρίων παῖδες* (20. 1). But it is hardly natural to speak of a mere girl as *παρθένος* or of a lad as *παῖς*. In Brelich's title *Paides e parthenoi* presumably refer to different age groups; otherwise it should be *Kuroi e korai*.

22. The name *Eurypylos* belongs to the Dionysiac ritual of conveying the mask, or it may be a statue, at the new-wine festival. When stories were told at Patrae, people preferred to hear of Eurypylus of Thessaly, the best-known bearer of the name, but there was also a Eurypylus son of Dexamenus, king of neighboring Olenus (Paus. 19.9–10). This is a local aetiology of the new-wine festival. King Dexamenus “receives” Dionysus, as does king Oeneus at Calydon, or king Amphictyon at Athens, or indeed the later *basileus* and his wife. At Olenus we also hear of a centaur named Eurytion, doubtless maddened by the wine (Paus. 18.1). The best-known story of the new-wine festival is set on Lemnos, source of wine and vinous habits in Homer, and here it is queen *Hypsipyle* who receives a ship from overseas and also launches her father in a casket, as if to explain the reception of Dionysus elsewhere (this father bears the Dionysiac name *Thoas*). The “wide gate” or

the “high gate” is at the city center to which the mask or statue is conveyed.

23. Eurypylus conformably with his epic background arrives at Patrae while it is Ionian, not Achaean. To judge from Pausanias, the early history of Achaea was recounted mainly in these terms, as a kind of ethnography. See Jacoby on *FGH* III B §I “Achaia.”

24. See Paus. 1.9.7 (^a *testimonium* of some value), 7.17.9 = Hermesianax fr. 8 Powell, 7.18.1 = fr. 9, 8.12.1 = fr. 10, 9.35.5 = fr. 11.

25. “But somehow it is characteristic of old age to thwart the young, and especially to be deaf to the sighs of young lovers . . . Their sad story proves, what has been proved in many and many a case besides, that love will break the laws of men and trample on the worship of the gods... For to man, and to man alone, better is it than life itself to love and to be loved” (transl. Frazer). The last remark, says Habicht (1985, 161-62), is revealing of Pausanias’ own nature. Yet it goes with his fondness for Hermesianax’ love elegies, which is revealing too.

26. Pfeiffer *ad loc.* quotes the scholiast and Poll. 3.40. To serve as *aition* Zeus and Hera are simply the archetypal wedded pair. But on reflection we see that their prenuptial affair must have occurred in the time of Cronus and Rhea, and everything lasted longer then, three hundred years or ten human generations in this case (schol. *Il.* 1.609 = Callim. fr. 48 Pfeiffer / 56 Massimilla).

27. So Pfeiffer on Callim. fr. 75.3-4, after Beazley. The point is not mentioned, so far as I can see, in other comment on either the Theseus story or the vase.

28. The two common month names formed from Artemis’ spring festivals, which can be approximately placed in various calendars in different parts of Greece, are *Ἀρτεμισιών* *vel sim.* and *Ἑλλάφ(ρ)ιος* *vel sim.* See Trjumpy (1997 index 1 s.vv.).

29. See Trjumpy (1997 index 1 *Ἀνθεστηριών, Διονύσιος*)

30. See Robertson (1993, 208-18) and Eliade’s *Enc. Rel.* 2 s. Anthesteria.

31. So the stories of Amphictyon at Athens and of Oeneus at Calydon (note 22); Oeneus also makes free of his wife. See Robertson (1993, 217-18). Conversely, the roaming hero who brings the mask of Dionysus to Patrae is oddly designated as a *basileus* at the beginning and the end of his story (Paus. 7.19.6, 8); the only conceivable reason is that he prefigures a civic magistrate so called.

32. The name is adopted in the publication of material by Kahil (1963, 1965, 1977, 1979, 1981, 1983, 1988) and by Palaiokrassa (1989, 1991), as by everyone else; no other name has been suggested.

33. Kahil thought of incense burning, citing traces of ash and pointing to *thymiateria* of similar shape, otherwise of divers purposes, including purification and libation (1965, 24-25). But the discussion since is untrammelled by any practical concern.

34. Travlos (1988, 77) shows a number of miniature vessels restored entire.

35. See Richter (1959, 310-12 with fig. 428), Ginouves (1962, 57-59). The *lebes gamikos* is mentioned by Kahil, together with other shapes, by way of comparison (1977, 97-98; 1981, 253; 1983, 243).

36. = Kahil (1963, pl. 14.3) / Hamilton (1989, pl. 86a) / *ThesCRA* 2 (2004) 3c “Initiation” 253d (an excellent photograph). Kahil suggests that a liquid is poured on the ground with fertilizing effect (1965, 24; 1983, 237), but why would Artemis want this?

37. Palaiokrassa (1989, 11; 1991, 67-73, 94, 134-37).

38. Kahil speaks of him as a “young priest” (1979, 81; 1983, 238) or an “acolyte” (1988, 809) or simply a “priest” (*LIMC* 2 [1984] Artemis 1034); yet the woman is so much taller that he must be a boy of tender years. According to a mythical interpretation of the scene, discussed and rejected below, they are Callisto and, as a mere boy, Arcas.

39. A common name for the summer festival was probably *Panama* “All-day

[rites]" (cf. chapter 6, note 17).

40. Larson (1997; 2001, 107–10) sets forth the contrast between Artemis' *Nymphai* and all the others. She observes that Artemis is almost never joined in cult with *Nymphai* proper and that the many *Nymphai* of cult, while often invoked with other deities, are seldom invoked with Artemis and never with her alone.

41. Hatzopoulos (1994, 25–34, 41–47, 121) publishes or reedits the inscriptions. Since then *νεβεύσασα / νεβεύσανσα / νεβεύσασσα* has appeared in three more inscriptions of Atrax (*SEG* 46.633, 636, 49.602) and one of Phayttus (*SEG* 51.732). Those of Lete are earlier, fourth century, than those of Thessaly, third and second century. The inscriptions of Lete and the tombs nearby belong to Thessalians, including some eminent families; Philip II perhaps installed them at this strategic point. Cf. Kouremenos, Parassoglou, and Tsantsanoglou (2006, 3). Hatzopoulos (1994, 45) and Brule (1997, 323–24) are too optimistic in supposing that the coincidence between Lete and Thessaly "indicates very probably a common heritage going back to the prehistory of the Greek-speaking peoples."

42. So Hatzopoulos (1994, 27, 31–32), Brule (1997, 322), L. Dubois, *DELG Suppl. s. νέος* To "play the fawn" (*νεβρός*), as if to prefigure Iphigeneia, is a pardonable error of the past. (The redactor of *SEG* 44.1748 turns faulty French into bogus Greek and gives us *νεβρός* "peacock.")

43. A female age-class undergoing initiation is taken as axiomatic by Hatzopoulos (1994, 41–53) and by Brule (1997, 324–25) and is entertained by Parker (2005c, 243). At this stage, says Brule (1997, 325–28), Artemis is propitiated for a loss of virginity that is yet to occur. Are we not informed that girls ripe for marriage serve Artemis as *kanêphoroi* so as to deprecate her impending anger? So scholl. Theocr. 2.66, quoted before this by Brule (1987, 307–8) and before that by Brelich (1969, 286). Theocritus' scholia describe an Athenian custom that is never intimated by any Athenian writer or any Athenian inscription: a Byzantine fantasy. The scholia are rightly treated with reserve by Petrovic (2007, 66–68). On the citation of Men. fr. 38 K-A see p. 338 below.

44.

Ἀρτέμιδι θροοῖαι Ἰππόλοχος ὑπὲρ / Εὐβιοτείας Ἀλεξιπείας νεβευσάνσας / λύτρα
(Hatzopoulos [1994, 2628] = *SEG* 44.453).

45. *Ἀρτέμιδι θροοῖαι Εὐπάτρα Παισιμεδοντείᾳ τελέουμα* (Hatzopoulos [1994, 301] = *SEG* 35.615). *Δαμμάτερι καὶ Κόραι / Μέλισσα Ἐπιγενείᾳ τελείουμα* (Hatzopoulos [1994, 40] = *SEG* 44.457).

46. The cult epithet *τέλεια* belongs to Hera as bride of Zeus, female partner in the cosmic union of the winter solstice. For the epithet as referring to *Θεογαμία / Τερὸς γάμος*, if not for the interpretation of the festival, see Salviat (1964, 650–54).

47. I explain the matter fully elsewhere: Robertson (1996b, 395–98; 2001, 48–50). The *Palladion* temple is now seen to be a congener not only of the temple of Athena *nike* on the Acropolis but of another, no doubt also of Athena, on the Areopagus (chapter 7, n. 39).

48. Round this time, Hecataeus gave a much more pragmatic and much less flattering reason for the expulsion of Pelasgians from Attica (Hdt. 6.137.1–2 = *FGrH* 1 F 127).

49. Philochorus' variant account is itself reported in two versions, which Parker (2005c, 248–49) treats with impartial skepticism. Yet schol. Luc. *Catapl.* 25 = F 100, speaking circumstantially of *παρθένους ἀρκετευομένας κτλ.* "maidens doing Bear service for the goddess at the *Brauronia*," is likely to be accurate in this respect. Lucian's scholia draw at intervals upon a special source for Attic cults: Robertson (1996d, 365–72).

50. Parker (2005c, 248) thinks of Bears abducted by Pelasgians as “a tradition very likely found also in Aristophanes’ *Lemnias* and Euripides’ *Hypsipyle*” (my emphasis). Now Harpocration s. *ἀρκτηῦσαι* cites those two plays, fr. 386 K-A and fr. 767 Kannicht, as well as Aristophanes’ *Lysistrata*, line 645, for mention of the Bears. We know that in *Lysistrata* it is but a passing mention; we do not know this of *Lemnias* and *Hypsipyle*; *omne ignotum pro magnifico*. Kannicht *ad loc.* suggests, after Bond, that Hypsipyle narrated a story like Herodotus’. Since that would be anachronistic, Parker suggests a prophecy by Dionysus *ex machina*. If only *Lysistrata* were a lost play, we might conjecture how defiant women lamented the fate of abducted Bears.

51. The gloss was brought to notice by Arvanitopoulos (1929) in publishing the dedication of Larisa (note 44), whence Clement (1934, 404), Hatzopoulos (1994, 27, 31–32), Brule (1997, 323). Either it escaped earlier proponents of initiation rites, even Brelich, or the term *gynaikes* rendered it uninteresting. But now it is trimmed to fit willy-nilly. According to Brule, *gynaikes* is here used “not in a sense connoting a certain age of life (adult or married women), but in that of the feminine gender.” Does a definition of *νέαι θήλειαι* need to emphasize the feminine gender? If it does, why not *θήλειαι*?

52. See Scanlon (1988) on the girl runners of Sparta and Olympia, Serwint (1993) on the statuettes that depict them.

53. Sourvinou-Inwood (1988, 33–67, 82–105) devotes most of her book to a close examination of all the iconographic details that can indicate a girl’s age; she puts it beyond doubt, if doubt there was, that the vessels depict girls ranging widely in age. The following vases show girls running who are tall and naked, with slim adult proportions and budding breasts and mostly with shoulder-length or even longer hair: Brauron 546 = Kahil (1965, pl. 7.5 /1983, 236 fig. 7); Brauron 548 = Kahil (1965, pl. 7.3); Cahn Coll. = Kahil (1977, 91 fig. 3, pl. 19.1–3, fig. C). Only by special pleading, as it seems to me, does Sourvinou-Inwood make out her case that these are all Bears. Parker (2005c, 234–35) surveys various opinions, including the opposite extreme, that Bears are not represented at all. His only definite conclusion, that the girls “fall into two groups, one at either end of the age band,” I would also question.

54. A. Hermay and M. Leguilloux, *ThesCRA* ι (2004), pp. 120–22 nos. 507–19 s. Sacrifices, offer a representative catalogue of perquisites.

55. Only the Lycian slave Xanthus lays it down as a rule for his cult of *Men tyrannos* “to furnish for the god what is due, right leg and skin and head and feet and breast-bit (*stêthynion*) and oil upon the altar(-table), and lamp and faggots and libation” (IG 2² 1366.9–10, cf. 1365). That is, all these things are consecrated to the god and thereby made available to be consumed or appropriated by the worshippers: see Stengel (1910, 170–71), Nilsson (1961, 374). We must reach thus far for a comparandum.

56. Cf. Chamoux (1988, 152), Dobias-Lalou (1993, 26–28).

57. This obvious inference does not appear among opinions surveyed by Parker (1983, 346); he rightly finds them unsatisfactory.

58. See Schmidt (1908, 94–98), Robertson (2002, 30–35). Schmidt should not have ventured even then to maintain that the worship of Artemis on the sixth is secondary to that of Apollo on the seventh.

59. Ever since Greek religion began to be studied in a historical way, it has been generally agreed that Apollo is a latecomer, and the question is put where he comes from. Answers include Thrace, Scythia, India, Babylon, Boghazkoi, Lycia, Cyprus, and Crete. But he more likely originates in the Greek peninsula in the early Dark Age: Robertson (2002).

60. Trümper (1998), while surveying Attic calendars of sacrifice, remarks that

the first decad of the month has fewer festivals than the second and third. On the contrary, the first decad probably has the most, the third certainly the fewest, and her sampling shows it.

61. These are probably days in the calendar, as the festivals of Artemis certainly are. That they are days of a lunation is possible only if Cyrenaeans at large keep count of them, for they determine when the Bear priestess is available.

62. For details, see Linders (1972, 17–19); also Cole (2004, 219–20). Cole favors a view often expressed, that such items were left unfinished by women who died in childbirth (cf. Eur. *Iph. Taur.* 1464–67, an alleged commemoration of Iphigeneia).

63. Dakoronia and Gounaropoulou (1992), Cole (1998, 34–35), Dillon (2002, 231–33), *ThesCRA* I (2004) 2d“Dedications” no. 118. Each provides an excellent photograph. The sacrificial victim is always described as a small bull (it would be a very small one, indeed a miniature species); surely it is a goat imperfectly rendered.

64. Theocritus’ scholiast imagines other customs as palliating the loss of virginity (note 43).

65. An outline of her story can be given only by selecting each detail out of many variants. It does not appear in any connected form before late mythographers or, more exactly, catasterismographers. They are indeed the necessary starting point, as Henrichs (1987, 254–67) observes, calling such reconstruction“applied mythography.” But I do not agree with Henrichs (1981, 198–208) that the story of Callisto is“regional” (in the same sense as the late stories about Munichia and Brauron we come to below), whereas the story of Iphigeneia is“epic and panhellenic.”

66. The exact meaning is hard to make out, and this need not be the result of some corruption that has not been located. Despite Kannicht *ad loc.* (Heidelberg 1959, 2.118–19), to change *ἐπέβας τὸ ἀπέβας* (Hartung) only makes matters worse.

67. In Arcadia, Artemis as a goddess of cult“is everywhere,” says Jost (1985, 395), with a general account on pages 393–425. Now if the cult of Artemis is behind the story, any cult of a heroine Callisto will be an artificial creation, just as that of Tricoloni near Megalopolis appears to be (Paus. 8.35.8, cf. 8.3.7). It is probably depicted on coins of the Arcadian League at different cities (*LIMC* Kallisto 9–10, cf. 12–13). Jost (1985, 405–10, cf. 1998, 233–34) rightly regards the cult as secondary, though she associates it rather with“Artemis’ character as *potnia theron*.” Similarly Henrichs (1987, 265–66).

68. In Euripides, Iphigeneia is translated to Brauron to serve simply as priestess, *κληιδουχέιν*, and also to be commemorated with certain offerings of textiles (*Iph. Taur.* 1462–67). It is quite misguided to regard her as a heroine of cult; Ekroth (2003) supplies an exhaustive refutation.

69. On Phanodemus’ services to Athenian cult see Mikalson (1998, 33–34, 36, 44).

70. So Jacoby on Phanodemus F 14, after Wilamowitz.

71. Iphigeneia turns into a bull in token of Artemis *tauropolos* (Nicander fr. 58 Schneider, etc.), doubtless at Halae Araphenides. The peculiar commemoration that Euripides contrives for Halae is no doubt intended to supplant one more familiar.

72. *κλίμακας* mss. *λείμακας* Pierson.“On Pierson’s *λείμακας* (a word which the tragedians, except at Pseudo-Eur. *IA* 1544, use only in lyrics) Hermann’s comment is: *temerarium est descriptiones tentare locorum quos quis ipse non viderit*”: Platnauer *ad loc.* (Oxford 1938). Scullion (2001, 226–29), in ^a useful study of the aetiology at Halae Araphenides and Brauron, should not have tacitly adopted this unlikely emendation.

73. See Travlos (1988, 62–63 figs. 59–62), Themelis (2002, 231 fig. 8). The

steps in their full extent are coeval with the Doric temple, datable to the beginning of the fifth century, but in some form they will be as old as the use of this high ground.

74. The figure is thus interpreted by Kahil (1977, 92–93; 1979, 81; 1983, 237–38; 1988, 808–9); *LIMC* 2 (1984) Artemis 1034. On a rival view, this is Callisto turning into a bear: Simon (1983, 87–88), I. McPhee, *LIMC* 5 (1990) Kallisto 18. But Callisto is not otherwise known on Athenian vases (*LIMC* Kallisto 17 is an acknowledged Niobe), and on Apulian vases we see her transformation just beginning in a realistic way, as pointed ears and furry hands (*LIMC* Kallisto 5–7), and a red-figure Actaeon cited by Simon for comparison (= *LIMC* Aktaion 81) likewise has no more than pointed ears and horns. Simon boldly attributes to Aeschylus' *Callisto* “the device of a mask to show the heroine's transformation on the stage.”

75. Simon (1983, 88) says by way of explanation, “Arkas, the young sitting bear, is not threatened by the goddess,” being the destined ancestor of the Arcadians. But what needs to be explained is why mother and son are both assuming bear shape at the same time.

76. The story of the cult at Munichia has not been neglected, it has been ransacked, in discussion of Artemis at Athens: Brelich (1969, 247–63), Sale (1975), Montepaone (1979), Osborne (1985, 162–63), Brule (1987, 182–88, 200–10, 214–22), Perlman (1989, 125–27), Dowden (1989, 20–23, 32–35, 43–47), Parker (2005c, 238–41). In some of this, under the banner of initiation rites, Munichia and Brauron are totally confused.

77. H. Erbse, Pausanias ε 35 *ἐμβαρὸς εἰμι*, reconstructs the entry as well as possible, with full citation of comparative material (Berlin 1950).

78. On the physical evidence for the shrine see Garland (1987, 162, 229–30). That the location is the very hill Munichia, not any rival site, is shown straightway by our story.

79. Peiraeus or any part of it has not been an island since geological times. It is the “crossing” from Athens to the island of Salamis. E. Meyer, *KIP* 4 (1972) 583 s. Peiraeus denies it, as some others do. But note the like-named *Porthmos*, known from the calendar of the Salaminian *genos* as the site of their cult of Heracles. It may not be far distant from their principal cult of Athena *skiras*, at the port of Phalerum. Cf. Lohmann and Schaefer (2000), rejecting Punta Zeza at Sunium, the usual candidate for *Porthmos*. It is likely that *Peiraeus*, *Porthmos*, and indeed the *Salaminioi* themselves are all named for the same heavy traffic.

80. The doctrine of initiation rites offers a short way of interpreting the story: the oracle requiring human sacrifice is fulfilled by two concurrent rites, the goat sacrifice and the Bear service, for the latter brings “seclusion” as a virtual death, a “ritual killing.” So Brelich (1969, 259–60, 263); similarly Henrichs (1981, 201 n2). A large part of that doctrine is mere old-fashioned allegory. Anyway, the Munichia story is about the Bear priestess, not the Bear service of little girls.

81. = Travlos (1988, figs. 79, 81) / *LIMC* Artemis 673 / *ThesCRA* 1 (2004), 1.53.

82. Most of the inventory of dedications to Artemis *Braurônia* consists of fine clothing: Linders (1972).

83. The conjectured *genos* duly appears in Parker (1996, 319–20).

84. Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 1.543 mentions *ἐγκύμων* and *ἐμβαρὸς* together, though not so as to illustrate the formation. There is no record of *βαρύς* in either Frisk, *GEW*, or Chantraine, *DELG*, either by itself or under *βαρος*.

85. Before the quotation, the entry has the sole word *εὐήθης*, an abbreviated form of the same gloss as Hes. s. *ἐμβαρὸς· ἡλίθιος κτλ*, citing “Menander in *Phasma*.”

86. 57–92 Sandbach (Oxford 1972) = 57–92 Arnott (Loeb 2000), 93–107 Sandbach = 193–207 Arnott; 93–107 Arnott consists of scraps without connected sense.

87. With the supplements of Turner and Handley, lines 79–81 run as follows:

(A) οἷχομαι. (B) τὸ παιδίον

[- - - - / αὐτός· οὐκ ἔμβαρός ἐστιν οὐ]τος· ὑπενόουν [ἐγὼ / τὸ παραχρῆμ' ὀρθῶς κτλ

With a slightly different supplement and punctuation, line 80 has more point:

οὐκ ἔμβαρός ἐστιν; αὐ]τὸς ὑπενόουν [ἐγὼ κτλ.

88. Brelich (1969, 229–311) is still the fullest account of the whole series. Parker (2005c, 218–27, 234) is the latest, with record of the progress intervening.

89. Both ἀρρηφόρος “basket bearer” (*ἄρρα cf. ἄρριχος and ἀλετρίς “miller” are officiants of Athena on the Acropolis at the season of the festival *Skirophoria*, whence her title *archegetis* as “leader” of the community in the militant endeavor of the harvest. An *arrhēphoros* is sometimes commemorated with a statue on the Acropolis; it was a father’s liturgy. An *aletris* mills the new grain for sacrificial cakes, perhaps especially the *selenai*. Far from being initiation rites, the offices were created at the same time as this programmatic festival (cf. Robertson [2005, 61–68]). For some different views, see Parker (2005c, 218–24).

90. The *textus receptus* of line 645 has long been *κᾶτ' ἔχουσα*
τὸν κροκωτὸν ἄρκτος ἢ Βραυρωνίοις. κᾶτ' ἔχουσα is a
correction, independently made by both Ellebodius and Bentley, of the manuscript

readings *καταχέουσα* BC *κατέχουσα* R. Better to illustrate initiation
rites, the reading *καταχέουσα* is upheld by Sourvinou-Inwood, and the
emendation *καὶ χέουσα* is offered by T. C. W. Stinton; the latter appears in

the new Oxford text of the play (J. Henderson, Oxford 1987). But others have
considered and rejected these proposals, most recently and most thoroughly Grebe
(1999) and Perusino (2002). I only add the point that, on the showing of the scholia,

Aristophanes was never understood to say anything but *ἔχουσα*.

91. Despite Kahil (1965, 26), the *krokōtos* could hardly double as an imaginary
bear’s coat.

92. *IG* 2² 1514.58, 62 = 1518.79; 1516.34 (?), 36 (?), 52; 1522.9, 12, 25, 28.

93. “Saffron-colored fabrics are still frequently used in traditional Greek bridal
costumes,” says Perlman (1983, 26), citing two examples in the Benaki Museum.

94. The few full-length dresses that are shown have no consistent detail, nor is
there any yellow color. As a subject for illustration, dressing up does not compare
with racing. Of course, exponents of “shedding” the *krokōtos* can point to the many
naked girls: so Henderson on *Lys.* 645.

95. Travlos (1988, 71, 76).

96. These entries of Harpocration are often pressed very hard, as by Brelich
(1969, 247, 265–67) and Parker (2005c, 233–34), but to little purpose. A summary
reference to Aristophanes and Euripides beguiles us into reconstructing lost plays
(note 50), but the all-important mention of a fifth-century decree is hardly noticed
(Brelich [1969, 264], Parker [2005c, 242]).

97. Tribute lists: Craterus F 1–3, 6–8, 18–20. Decrees of condemnation: F 5, 11–
12, 14, 16–17.

98. See Hurwit (1999, 197–98, 315).

99. As to Brauron, see Travlos (1988, 55–56), Goette (2001, 221–24).

100. “We infer from [Craterus’] quotation a civic regulation of the cult— analogous to that for Eleusis—in the fifth century.” So Jacoby on F 9, after

Wernicke, *RE* 2.1 (1895) 1171 s. *ἄρκτεία, ἄρκτοι*. Similarly Erdas (2002, 132–34), but assigning the regulation to “the moment of the rise to prominence of the Philaid Cimon,” which seems too early for the improvements on the Acropolis and perhaps for Craterus’ collection.

101. Cahn Coll. 502 = Kahil (1977, pl. 19).

102. The Brauron story is itselfold in somewhat different language but with no substantive difference by both the Suda s. *ἄρκτος ἢ Βραυρωνίους* and scholl. *Ar. Lys.* 645.

103. To identify the decree of the story with that of Craterus is only natural: so Krech (1888, 99–100). As always, Jacoby disagrees with Krech. He postulates two unrelated decrees, a mythical one occurring in the Attic chroniclers and a historical one in Craterus; so too Erdas (2002, 132). And so again Parker (2005c, 242n102): Craterus’ mention of the Bears “suggests that a decree spoke of the institution; it does not prove the decree wildly postulated by the lexicographers genuine.” *The lexicographers?*

104. It may well be asked whether the story appeared in Craterus, who included some curious peripheral matter with his text of the decrees (F 10, 12). We know nothing of Craterus’ date or circumstances—Jacoby and now Erdas dismiss any

speculation arising from [T 3–4]—unless the ethnic *ὁ Μακεδών* gives a clue (Plut. *Arist.* 26.2 = T 2). Though “Craterus” is a Macedonian name, we do not expect a learned writer to be known for his country rather than his native city. Perhaps it is reproachful, because he worked at Athens during the years of Macedonian domination, 322–307 B.c. Erdas (2002, 38–46) associates Craterus with the efforts of Aristotle’s school to assemble laws and constitutions, which implies a similar date. If so, he is too early for the story.

105. Or is it something much deeper, and in tune with initiation rites? Does the girl finally provoke the acculturated bear by a licentious exhibition such as culture alone permits—by exposing herself? For she is said to “grow impudent,”

ἀσελγαινούσης. The possibility is explored at length by Parker (2005c, 239–40; cf. 243–48).

106. Artemis as a child upon her father’s knee, still so little that she cannot touch his beard in reaching up, asks for the gift of perpetual virginity, and of bow and arrows, and of these two groups of companions, and of mountains rather than cities, which she will visit only rarely as birth goddess. Zeus caresses her and, with a smile and a nod, grants all she wishes. Artemis is immediately grown up and goes off to claim the gifts and try them out. The regular nymphs are labeled as

ἀμφιπόλους and *ἀμορβούς* (lines 15, 45), both meaning “attendants,” and their equerry duties are fully described (lines 16–17, 162–67). This does not sound like a virtual initiation; it needs some glossing. Jeanmaire (1939, 319–20) thinks of the younger group as playmates for the child and of the older group as

their “nurses,” his rendering of *ἀμφιπόλους*, and also thinks of both the child upon her father’s knee and the nine-year-olds as being “on the threshold of puberty,”

his rendering of *παῖς ἔτι κουρίζουσα* (line 5). Language, context, nature, custom are all sacrificed recklessly to the cause of initiation rites.

107. The twenty regular nymphs are daughters of several named rivers in Crete;

the sixty little girls are all of them daughters of the great river Oceanus—Hesiod gave him a full three thousand daughters. The unwonted number “sixty” recurs in Theocritus’ picture of a band of girls sporting beside the Eurotas as age-mates of Helen—“four times sixty *korai*, the female youth” (Id. 18.22–24). They anoint themselves and run races, the same activity attested for the little Bears. Perhaps then Theocritus rings the changes on Callimachus. “Four times” is not explained, if it needs to be, but the hypothesis seems better than a Lycurgan institution of just these dimensions (so Calame [1977, 1.381]), which for Theocritus would be a most uncommon antiquarian exactitude.

108. It may be that protest is already belated and superfluous. A volume of conference papers published in 2003 is in the nature of a slow requiem for initiation rites: it hardly offers criticism, only recognition that this once glorious heuristic paradigm must now be replaced by some other one. A contribution that classicists will read with profit is Lincoln (2003), describing the principles and methods of one who for long guided their research and enriched their vocabulary, V. W. Turner.

109. There is also Plato’s mention of marriage rites as occurring at three stages, before, during and after marriage (*Leg.* 6, 774e–75a), which roughly correspond to the three stages of Artemis’ ritual.

110. The magic likeness is illustrated by Bevan (1987, 19–20) and more fully by Perlman (1989, 111–27)—but “magic” is my term, not theirs. Perlman cites passages of Aristotle in which the bear’s manner of mating and of bearing and fostering its young are described as akin to man’s.

111. Among bear vestiges at Greek cult sites, Perlman (1989, 116) points to the cave *Arkoudhospilia* and its chapel of *Panayia Arkoudhiotissa* on the north coast of eastern Crete; see further Sporn (2002, 275–77). It was a place of worship in Late Minoan and again in Classical and Hellenistic times, when a graffito mentions “Nymphs” and *pinakes* depict Apollo and Artemis.

112. Apropos of the myths and rites of Artemis, Forbes Irving (1990, 46–47, 67–68, 73–75) and Parker (2005c, 246–48) insist on “the almost wholly negative ancient view of the bear” (Parker 247III26). The myth of Callisto is cautionary or “anti-erotic” (Forbes Irving); the Bear service is a “paradox,” an “exorcism” of the fears attending childbirth (Parker).

Suppliant Purifications

Synopsis

The last section, as it appears to be, is again arranged very neatly, with both a general heading and related subheadings for three subsections of nearly equal length. The rules in question are said to be three kinds of “suppliant purification.” They are in fact as widely different as any three rituals could be.

The first purification, one that is “conjured,” is about exorcising a house when you know that ghosts have been conjured against it by an enemy. You conjure them in turn with prescribed words, and you stage an agreeable repast using figurines made of either wood or clay, and you carefully dismiss them. It is rudimentary magic for a silly, fearful person.

The second purification, “paid or not paid,” is about consulting the local oracle of Apollo. Why one does so is not stated; perhaps one feels polluted in some way familiar at Cyrene, or perhaps in any way at all. The oracle may ordain a sacrifice of a certain value. But if not, one still makes a simple vegetable offering and a libation. Such are the two forms indicated by the subheading. It is a continuing and hereditary obligation, recurring each year and lasting until the third generation. Both language and substance are rather like the tithing rules. But the present obligation is not onerous at all, and it will be imposed only to satisfy the conscience of a pious person.

The third purification, “slaying with one’s own hand,” is an elaborate public procedure broadly familiar from literature but with many further details, also echoed by an inscription of Lindus. A so-called intercessor takes charge, assisted by a herald, a priest, and a group of witnesses who are all recruited at certain public offices. The intercessor seats the person on a fleece at the entrance to Apollo’s sanctuary and washes and anoints him. The witnesses form up and look on in silence, obedient to the herald. The person now goes into the sanctuary, followed by the witnesses, and makes a preliminary

offering of cakes, and—but here the inscription breaks off. The subheading shows that he himself slays the sacrificial victim as the culminating act.

The three rules are alternative remedies for three very different persons, on a rising scale. The very language is suited to each case: crude and naive, minute and repetitive, concise and fluent. With another line or two, which would have completed the third rule, the last section closely balances the items that come before the tithing rules and the rites of Artemis. It is likely that the inscription was thus complete.

The Curious Headings

The two long sections on the tithed class and the rites of Artemis are followed by another long section which is probably the last of the inscription (lines 110-41). It is signaled as a separate entity, even more plainly than the other two sections, by a general heading and three subheadings. The general heading is the single word *ἱκεσίων* in large letters, spanning a whole line; the subheadings are each a phrase consisting of the word *ἱκέσιος* and defining adjectives. The defining adjectives are respectively *ἐπακτός* (line 111), *ἄτερος, τετελεσμένος ἢ ἀτελής* (line 122), *τρίτος, αὐτοφόνος* (line 132). Apart from “second” and “third,” the adjectives all have some special meaning that refers to the ritual prescribed. This is awkward, since *ἱκέσιος* is itself an adjective meaning “suppliant”—the corresponding noun forms are *ἱκέτας* “a suppliant” and *ἱκετήρια* “a supplication.” And the three rites successively prescribed could hardly be more diverse. Only the last is recognizably a supplication; it is in fact a standard procedure for purifying a suppliant of his pollution, conducted by one who “intercedes for a suppliant” (*ἀφικετεύω*). The first rite is about exorcising ghosts from a house, and the second is about consulting an oracle to determine one’s obligations. Each of them has its difficulties; indeed the formulations just given are far from being agreed. But the greatest difficulty is the notion *ἱκεσιος* that embraces everything.

If the difficulties of the text are daunting, the solutions proposed by scholars are confounding. Originally, the adjective *ἱκέσιος* was treated as if it were the noun *ἱκέτης*. It was supposed that the general heading means “of suppliants” and that the three subsections concern three kinds of “suppliant” defined by the respective phrases, dubiously rendered as “sent from abroad,” “initiated or not initiated,” “homicide.”¹ This was very difficult; it was impossible to say how the respective rites answered the description. An alternative view was

advanced in 1937, that *ἰκέσιος* denotes not a “suppliant” but a “visitant,” the etymological meaning of *ἵκω* “come.”² A dangerous ghostly revenant is described by phrases meaning “conjured up,” “effective or not effective,” “avenger of the slain.” This too was very difficult; agreement receded even further and understanding languished even more. When the lead tablet of Selinus was published in 1993, the revenant interpretation was galvanized again, and it now looms overpoweringly.³ For the tablet seems to address the fear of homicide pollution, and column B seems to echo *ἰκέσιος* and *αὐτοφόνος* with *ἐλάστερος* and *αὐτορέκτας*. The two documents, at Selinus and Cyrene, seem interlocking; in both we seem to hear of avenging spirits with strange names and of elaborate rules for the purification of the guilty or the anxious.

We really must think again about *ἰκέσιος* (as we did about *ἐλάστερος* in chapter 15). As we know it otherwise, *ἰκέσιος* is an adjective meaning “suppliant” and nothing else (*LSJ* s. v. I 1-3). The corresponding noun, likewise meaning “a suppliant” and nothing else, is *ἰκέτης*. Usage does not vary according to period or dialect; both adjective and noun are employed side by side in Doric as in Attic and Ionic. Both serve as personal names, *Ἰκέσιος* and *Ἰκέτας* or *Ἰκέτης*.⁴ These facts leave no room for any of the current views of our inscription.

In 1927, when the inscription was published, the language of Cyrene was little known. It could be suggested that the form *ἰκέσιος* was here equivalent to *ἰκέτης*.⁵ Even then, the suggestion was surprising. The noun *ἰκέτης* is frequent from Homer onward and in poetry is even used attributively instead of the adjective; it is the natural word for either suppliant persons or their condition. The adjective *ἰκέσιος* is not so frequent, though it is a standard epithet of Zeus. Apart from Cyrene, the noun *ἰκέτας* occurs often in Doric inscriptions.⁶ Among Doric names, *Ἰκέτας*, *Ἰκέτα*, *Ἰκέτις*, *Ἰκετιῶς*, *Ἰκεταΐδας* are variants of the noun form; only *Ἰκέσιος* and *Ἰκεσία* are adjective forms.⁷ It cannot be that at Cyrene *ἰκέσιος* takes the place of *ἰκέτας*. If three kinds of suppliant person were in view, the noun form would appear in the headings, first as *ἰκετῶν* and then, three times, as *ἰκέτας*.

A different meaning was tried. The words are formed undoubtedly from *ἵκω* “come.” Perhaps then *ἰκέσιος* refers not to a suppliant who comes to entreat but to a supernatural being who comes to punish, a visitant.⁸ But whatever the meaning, it is the same word, and both noun and adjective forms are current. The suggestion requires that both forms, *ἰκέσιος* and *ἰκέτης*, mean “visitant,” as adjective and as noun. But if they did, we would still find *ἰκετῶν* as the general heading and *ἰκέτας* in each subheading. It is a further

objection that personal names (apart from jesting nicknames) will have a favorable or a neutral meaning. No one would be called *Ἰκέσιος* or *Ἰκέτης* if the name evoked a dangerous spirit.

It is time to ask the obvious question, whether *Ἰκέσιος* is not used substantively with a noun understood. In the only other heading of our inscription, that of the tithing rules, *ὀκώχμιος* is used substantively with the tithed person understood: “(one) bound or liable” etc. (line 32). With *Ἰκέσιος* we shall not understand a person, the noun *Ἰκέτης* being available. Instead, we shall understand some familiar noun that comes straight to mind, as in the phrases *καὶ ἐς ἱερὰ καὶ ἐς βάβαλα καὶ ἐς μιὰ* (scil. *χρήματα*, lines 9—10), *ἐς καθαρὸν* (scil. *τόπον*, line 29 etc.), *ἐπὶ τὸμ πατρωϊον* (scil. *τόπον*, line 130).⁹ With *Ἰκέσιος* “suppliant” the noun that comes straight to mind is *καθαρμοῦς* “purification.” In Greek literature, forms of these two words go together like a horse and carriage, or like the two boxes of *Advanced Search* in *TLG*. Whenever a suppliant appears, he is likely to be purified. Whenever someone is purified, he is likely to be a suppliant. At Athens, a work otherwise unknown called *The Traditions of the Eupatridae* is quoted for a part of

the ritual *περὶ τῆς τῶν ἰκετῶν καθάρσεως* “concerning the purification of suppliants” (*FGrH* 356 F 1). The title agrees remarkably with the sense we must postulate for the general heading, and the ensuing quotation agrees remarkably with the third rite here prescribed.

The third rite is moreover a very fitting conclusion to the whole body of rules. As was said, it is the standard procedure for purifying a suppliant of his pollution, with such means as a woolly fleece and a washing. The first and second rites are, in a manner of speaking, the purification of a house by exorcism and the purification of a person by such means as an oracle prescribes. Purification has been a constant theme throughout the inscription, as in purifying several sanctuaries (of the wind gods, of Apollo, of Artemis) whenever this is needed. The tithed person, on reaching the end of his tithing obligation, is assured that *καθαρμοῦς ἀποχρεῖ* “the purification suffices” (line 75). Most strikingly, all the rules are introduced in two lines of larger letters as *καθαρμοῖς καὶ ἀγνήϊαις κα[ὶ ἰκετ]ήϊαις* “purifications and abstinences and [supplications]” (lines 2-3: no weight can be given to the last term, which is only one of several possibilities). The inscription has often been referred to as *lex cathartica* or the like.¹⁰ This is not quite accurate, but it conveys the impression that the authorities sought to produce. They sought to do so especially in the last section.

The general heading is simple, *ἰκεσίων (καθαρμῶν)* “of

suppliant (purifications),” but the simplicity is contrived, so as to introduce three unequal items. The three subheadings take a regular form, *ἰκέσιος (καθαρμός) κτλ*, but this too is contrived, giving little indication of the content. We hear of “suppliant (purification), conjured by magic”; “suppliant (purification) the second, paid or not paid”; “suppliant (purification) the third, slaying with one’s own hand.” The first rite is a mere conjuring with figurines, foolish and grotesque. The second is an inquiry, or repeated inquiry, at a local oracle, punctilious but of no great consequence. The third, however, is the customary treatment of a suppliant as a rather elaborate public ritual. The three unequal items are meant to appeal to different kinds of people. How can they be brought together? Only the third is truly “a suppliant purification,” but if they all are so called, they all acquire the same impartial dignity.

Purification by Magic

Suppliant (purification), conjured by magic. If something be sent against the house, if he knows from whom it came against him, he shall name him while giving notice for three days. If he is dead beneath the earth or is done for in some other way, if he knows the name, he shall give notice by name, but if he does not know it, the words are “O creature, whether you be man or woman.” After making figurines male and female of either wood or clay, after receiving them for entertainment, set out the share of everything. When you have done the customary things, bring the figurines and the shares to an uncultivated wood and set them up properly.

With each subsection the translation needs to be repeated first, so strange the content is. The verbal adjective *ἐπακτός* of the subheading is here rendered “conjured by magic”; I discuss this meaning below, after the content.

The word has the general meaning “brought on,” and the subheading was at first rendered “a suppliant brought on,” afterward “a visitant brought on.” The ensuing rule lent itself in several ways to the notion that homicide is at issue.¹¹ Given the meaning “suppliant,” the first clause was rendered and glossed “if he be sent to the house,” scil. in Cyrene, scil. from somewhere else, as if he were a homicide in exile, a predicament often met with in literature. But then it is baffling that the rule concerns not the newly arrived suppliant but a sender whose role we do not hear of otherwise—and whose name and sex and whereabouts may be quite unknown.¹² Given the meaning “visitant,” the clause is rendered “if he be sent against the house,” scil. by means of magic.¹³ The words do in fact describe a magical attack, and to this extent subserve the new misunderstanding. After the

magical attack, the purification itself is all about magic. And the magic is of the most wishful and childish kind, astonishing to hear of in a public document.

In either case it is wrong to treat αἴ κα ἐπιπεμφθῆι as a personal verb “if he be sent.” Both ἐπιπεμφθῆι and οἱ ἐπήνθε in the next line are impersonal passives, a style often adopted in ritual language.¹⁴ A superstitious person fears an attack upon his house: “if something be sent against the house” or “if there be a *sending* against the house,” “if he knows from whom it came” or “from whom *the coming* may be.” It is remarkable how the attendant circumstances are set out at length, as five “if” clauses—if this or that has happened, if “he knows” this or that. To be sure, many other rules follow from some circumstance briefly indicated: each tithing rule begins “if a grown man is tithed” *vel sim*. But this rule depends upon quite subjective, indeed imaginary, circumstances. The rule indulges someone who is prey to irrational fears; it indulges paranoia. Someone fears that his house is being assailed by black magic. To be assailed at home, within one’s own four walls, is the utmost horror.

What does the paranoid person “know” about the attack? “If he knows from whom it came against him,” he voices the name for three days. It is said next that “if he is dead beneath the earth or is done for in some other way,” he either voices the name or, being ignorant of the name, substitutes “O creature.”¹⁵ This cannot be the same enemy, the ill-wisher—as if ill wishes were always uttered on a deathbed. Instead, it is a corpse or a ghost whom the ill-wisher has recruited for his purpose. He may have resorted to a fresh grave: “if he is dead beneath the earth.” Or he may have called on someone dead but unburied, a victim of misadventure, e.g. drowning, that precluded burial: “if he is done for in some other way.” Anyone whose death was premature found no rest, buried or not, before his appointed time and was therefore an effective agent in black magic; when a curse tablet was deposited in a grave, the graves of the young were often preferred.¹⁶ How the paranoid person arrives at his knowledge only he can say, but Plato refers to suspicions aroused by the sight of wax dolls placed at house doors or crossroads or tombs (*Leg.* 11, 933a-b).¹⁷

Thus the ritual begins with three days of incantation, calling upon the ill-wisher and the agent(s) whom he has recruited (lines 109-17). Thereafter, on the fourth day we may suppose, it proceeds to a manipulation of figurines (lines 117-21).¹⁸ These will be either wood or clay, representing the agents closely enough that the sex is distinguished. They are entertained at home with a proper meal, “the share of everything.” It is like a dolls’ tea party, but more somber. At Selinus, we recall, the *elasteros* was likewise entertained with a full meal exactly prescribed, but as a dangerous power of nature he was

unseen and was approached at some site where his attack was feared. The effigies of these dangerous spirits are received at home, the place they threaten. At Selinus, at the site where the meal was laid out, there was a leave-taking with special words and gestures. This is not a possible conclusion for the ritual at home; instead, the figurines and the meal are carried far away to some lonely place. What is done with them is *ἐρεῖσαι*, an unexpected word.¹⁹ It can hardly mean either that the items are simply deposited or that they are made away with, as by burying. Since the basic meaning of *ἐρεῖδω* is “prop”, i.e. fix in some position, it must be that the figurines and the meal are stationed as before. The imaginary scene is meant to continue forever, like the banquets of Elysium.²⁰

Our inscription caters to this fearful person by acknowledging all his fears. He is a definite type, like the Superstitious Man of Theophrastus (*Char.* 16).²¹ The Superstitious Man purifies his house *Ἐκάτης φάσκων ἐπαγωγὴν γεγονέναι* “because he says that Hecate has been conjured against it” (16.7).²² This too is a magical

attack, the operative word being *ἐπάγω* rather than *ἐπιπέμπω*. At Athens the magical defense is to *καθαῖραι* “purify” the house by some means that is not described—perhaps it is the same means as at Cyrene. Athenians propitiate Hecate anyway, on the first of each month, by setting out *δεῖπνα* “meals” at a crossroads.²³ If Hecate nonetheless attacks a given house, she may well be entertained there with a meal. So she is at Syracuse, on the showing of Sophron’s mime *Women Who Say They’ll Drive Out the Goddess*, i.e. Hecate (frs. 3—9 K-A). Why Hecate is approaching the house we do not know, but in the principal fragment the women set up a table and prepare to sacrifice a puppy; the door is thrown open, and Hecate is greeted with the words “Lady, you will find a meal and blameless hospitality” (fr. 4). It is an actual meal, but the guest of honor is seen only with the mind’s eye. It is probable that she did not come alone. Hecate is feared above all for the swarm of monsters and ghosts that she leads out of the underworld.²⁴ If the text is rightly constituted, her underworld companion Mormolyce is named a little further on.²⁵ And she is addressed as *πρύτανις νερτέρων* “chief of the dead” (fr. 7).²⁶ If conjuring Hecate against a house involves ghosts as well, the occasion is all the more like ours at Cyrene.²⁷

Why is the term *ἐπακτός* chosen for the subheading? There are two stages to the ritual, three days of calling out names—or else “O creature, whether you be man or woman”—and then the physical action of entertaining the figurines. The calling out is emphasized; it is loud and prolonged; it works upon the spirits; it constrains them to attend at the subsequent procedure. It is an “incantation” or

“conjunction,” *ἐπωιδή* or *ἐπαγωγή*. These two terms are used globally for powerful, aggressive magic.²⁸ The only adjective form in common use is *ἐπακτός*. When Phaedra in Euripides says that she feels somehow polluted, the vulgar nurse inquires, *ἐξ ἐπακτοῦ πημονῆς* “from harm conjured against you?” (*Hipp.* 318). A curse tablet from the sanctuary of Demeter at Cnidus speaks of the different kinds of *pharmakon* that an enemy may have resorted to, and the last and most insidious is *ἐπακτόν*.²⁹ A protective charm that has been found in much the same form at Phalasarna, Locri, Himera, and Selinus ends with an assurance that it works against several enemy devices like those at Cnidus—the last seems to be *ἐπαγωγή*.³⁰ The tablets are all Dorian, occurring throughout the Dorian domain from east to west.³¹ Cyrene too was probably acquainted with the formula. It may be the very reason why our inscription uses this *vox propria* of magic to commend the first form of suppliant purification.

After the conjunction comes the business of the figurines. They are entertained with table hospitality, just like the *elasteros* at Selinus. This does not mean that the *elasteros* is a ghost. Either occasion is understandable by itself as a magical use of table hospitality. The magic is more dignified at Selinus than at Cyrene. It is most dignified of all when it is addressed to say Heracles or the Dioscuri in the standard rite of *theoxenia*.

Purification by Asking the Oracle

Suppliant (purification) the second, paid or not paid. After sitting down at the public shrine, if it is ordained by the oracle, however much is ordained, pay accordingly. But if nothing is ordained, offer fruit of the earth and libation every year in perpetuity. But if he omits it, twice as much again. If a child neglects it in ignorance and it is ordained for him, whatever he is bidden on inquiring of the oracle, this he shall pay to the god and shall sacrifice, if he knows where it is, at the ancestral tomb. If not, ask the oracle.

The second rule is not about magic but about consulting an oracle and worshipping as directed. So much is agreed, for the language is unmistakable. But efforts to apply this to a *hikesios*, to a suppliant or a visitant, have led to no acceptable result. The label *τετελεσμένος ἢ ἀτελής* is baffling. At least six different meanings have been proposed, whether for suppliant or visitant.³² It must suffice to acknowledge them briefly; each has many difficulties that could only be conveyed by extended discussion.

As to a suppliant, perhaps he is “initiated or not initiated,” i.e. admitted to a secret cult.³³ Or perhaps he is “attached or not attached,” i.e. to some regular public cult.³⁴ Or perhaps he is “consecrated or not consecrated,” i.e. accorded refuge in a

sanctuary.³⁵ Or perhaps he is “discharged or not discharged,” i.e. from compensation for killing someone.³⁶ As to a visitant, perhaps he is “successful or unsuccessful,” i.e. in wreaking vengeance.³⁷ Or perhaps he is “established or not established,” i.e. as the object of cult.³⁸

Let us try the same approach as before. If these words describe neither a suppliant nor a visitant but another purifying ritual, *καθαρός*, we expect the label to agree with what is done: *ἐπακτός* “conjured” agrees with the conjuring that follows. In the present case, an oracular inquiry determines *ὅπόσσω* “how much” is needed; *οὕτως τελίσκεσθαι* “pay accordingly.”³⁹ After another inquiry, *τοῦτο ἀποτεῖσει* “this he shall pay.” Here are two words meaning “pay.” Another one, the standard word for “pay” in both literature and documents, is *τελέω*, as in the label (*LSJ* s. v. II).⁴⁰ When the purifying ritual is thus conducted, by paying the amount prescribed, it is *τετελεσμένος* “paid.” But the oracle may not, after all, prescribe a payment, and instead of paying, one will “offer fruit of the earth,” etc. An alternative word is needed for the alternative form of ritual. After *τετελεσμένος*, it is hard to think of a better word than *ἀτελής*. As a derivative of *τέλος* it means “not taxed” rather than “not paid” (*LSJ*, *Rev. Suppl.* s. v. III 1 a—b). Yet this meaning too is perfectly appropriate since the payment imposed by the oracle may just as well be called a tax. As a translation “paid or not taxed” would be accurate, but “paid or not paid” is better because it reproduces the assonance.

We turn to the details, which are reminiscent of the tithing rules: the setting is again Apollo’s sanctuary, and certain obligations are set forth. An oracle is consulted repeatedly, first by “sitting” at the place just as one sits in the temple at Delphi, and twice more as indicated by *μαντευομένωι* and *χρήσασθαι*. The responses are *προφέρηται*, used three times, and *ἀναιρεθῇ*, all of them impersonal passives. It is a local oracle and a familiar procedure. The participial phrase *ἰσάμενος ἐπὶ τῷ δημοσίωι ἱαρόωι* evokes the procedure straightway; it is natural to begin with a nominative rather than an accusative phrase, even though the main verb is infinitive rather than future indicative (the rule uses three infinitives and two future indicatives in just eight lines).⁴¹ An inquirer at Delphi, after all the preliminaries, enters the *megaron* and sits down, to be addressed by the Pythia (*Hdt.* 7.40.1, *ἴζοντο*, cf. 1.47.2, 5.92 β 2).⁴² The site at Cyrene has been identified with a grotto on the south side of the great sanctuary, reached by a staircase descending from the west end of Apollo’s temple, but we cannot be sure of this.⁴³

The inquirer may be told to *pay* a certain amount, but if no amount is set, he sacrifices fruit of the earth and a libation—an offering in kind, of cakes and wine. Surely then the payment is a more costly offering—an animal or animals of the value indicated. These are

all sacrifices to Apollo, either animals or cakes and wine. So it is with “the child” who inquires again, having neglected to maintain the yearly offerings that were required of a forebear. He pays the amount *to the god*, i.e. to Apollo—it must be that he sacrifices to Apollo in accordance with the amount, since ancient worshippers did not contribute money to the church. The child has the further duty of sacrificing at the tomb of his forebear, if he knows where it is.⁴⁴ This sacrifice of course implies that his payment to Apollo is a sacrifice as well. Or else it is a lesser offering in kind, for the sacrifice at the tomb will be a mere offering in kind. If the tomb cannot be found, the child inquires yet again at the oracle—and no doubt the oracle will prescribe a compensatory offering to Apollo.

In all this we are reminded strongly of the tithing rules: a tithed person sacrifices animals of the value for which he is assessed. Tithed persons are a lesser class of citizen whose tithing obligation is to Apollo; it was suggested that they are, or include, the bastard sons of a Cyrenaean father and an alien mother, especially a Libyan mother. Here anxious persons consult the oracle of Apollo, and it places them under obligation to Apollo. The tithing obligation is forgiven in the third generation, if the last section of the tithing rules was rightly understood. After a grandson once fulfills the obligation, he becomes a regular citizen. Here the obligation imposed by the oracle of Apollo is likewise inherited, so that a child may neglect it. This too is likely to occur in the third generation, not the second, since the child may not know the grave of the forbear where an offering is now required as amends—it must be a grandfather, not a father. A further inference should be drawn. This occasion will arise—the possible neglect and the means of redressing it—just because the obligation imposed by the oracle is also to be forgiven in the third generation, after it is once acknowledged.

These are two ancient customs of Cyrene, a hereditary obligation to Apollo on the part of lesser citizens and a hereditary obligation to Apollo to be imposed on anyone the god deems liable. The second custom relies on superstitious fear, or perhaps on the constraint of neighborly opinion.

Purification by the Customary Means of Supplicating and Sacrificing

Suppliant (purification) the third, slaying with one's own hand. Intercede at the office of [chief priest] and the body of three tribes. When he has announced that he [receives], after seating him on the threshold on a white fleece, wash and anoint him. And all go out to the public street and keep silent while they are outside, those who respond to the annunciator. Go on [into the sanctuary], the one who is object of the intercession, [for the sacrifices.] And those following [come in after him. When] he has offered cakes and other [usual things] . . .

The defining word of the heading is *αὐτοφόνος* “slaying with one’s own hand.” On the usual view that all three rules are for “a suppliant,” this is a homicide; it may be thought as well that the case is aggravated, that it was indeed by his own hand, or that it was his own kin.⁴⁵ The third rule is for once consistent. It is, with some extra features, the traditional mode of purification known from literature, from antiquarian comment, from inscriptions elsewhere. Someone else receives the guilty man as suppliant and purifies him with expressive purifying actions. At the end the person thus redeemed offers sacrifice. It would be surprising only that a homicide, the worst offender, is singled out for a remedy that applies to any grievous pollution. On the other view, that all three rules are for “a visitant,” this is either a homicide victim or a suicide.⁴⁶ What seems so obviously a mode of purification must be interpreted as a means of averting a dangerous spirit.

The heading, however, will describe the ritual, not a suppliant or a visitant. This is the final and foremost *καθαρός*. It is labeled as “slaying with one’s own hand” because it leads up to a demonstrative sacrifice in which one slays the animal with one’s own hand. The term *αὐτοφόνος* is synonymous with *αὐτορέκτας* at Selinus, where an anxious person entreats an *elasteros* with table hospitality, laying out the meal by himself, even slaying the animal by himself, whether it is a piglet as first indicated or a more costly victim as provided afterward (chapter 14). That ritual was compared with public festivals named for a demonstrative slaying of animals, such as the famous *Βουφόνια* of Athens. It is unusual for a worshipper who sacrifices to take charge of slaying the animal. A person entertaining an *elasteros* does so in order to make the hospitality more genuine. At certain public festivals a body of officiants do so in order to represent the whole citizen body more effectively. A person newly purified does so in order to display his fitness to worship.

We should examine the ritual step by step. This is the fullest description anywhere of the standard form of purification. By happy coincidence a decree of Lindus came to light not long ago to confirm an important point, the office of intercessor.⁴⁷

The first step is to *ἀφικετέειν* at the two entities mysteriously named. The verb has been taken in two ways, as referring to the suppliant or to an intercessor.⁴⁸ If it is the suppliant, it will mean “proceed to supplication” or the like; if it is an intercessor, it will mean “intercede (for a suppliant).” Further on, where the context is fragmentary, *τὸν ἀφικετευόμενον* will be interpreted as either middle or passive, as “the one proceeding to supplication” or as “the one who is object of the intercession.” Now the second interpretation is preferable anyway, since we hear at once of someone who seats the

suppliant and attends to him with purifying actions, i.e. an intercessor. In the decree of Lindus, s. *iii*, the final lines, which alone survive, set forth the penalty for anyone, any citizen it appears, who contravenes the decree while ἀφικετεύων ἢ δεκόμενος τοὺς ἰκέτας] “interceding for or receiving the suppliants” (SEG 39.729 lines 4–5). These words correspond to ἀφικετεύειν at Cyrene and also to the announcement the intercessor makes at the two entities, that he [δέκε]σθαι “receives” a suppliant.⁴⁹ Although the rule is for a suppliant, it begins with an intercessor.

The intercessor first declares his purpose at the two entities, then sets to work. Yet the procedure involves others besides the intercessor and the suppliant. A group of persons are on hand, referred to first as “those who respond to the annunciator” and then as “those following.” The agent noun προαγγελητής “annunciator” denotes someone other than the intercessor, someone who calls out, “Come forth and keep silent!” It is a herald.⁵⁰ Next, the suppliant is to “go on [into the sanctuary]”—the threshold where he was first seated evidently belongs to the sanctuary—and begins to sacrifice. The sanctuary is the great sanctuary of Apollo, where the inscription is posted and to which the rules repeatedly direct us. A priest will be needed at the sanctuary even though he is not mentioned. At Lindus, the procedure likewise involves both a herald and a priest, mentioned in the penalty clauses.⁵¹ At Athens, the excerpt quoted below from *The Traditions of the Eupatridae* likewise refers to persons who may well be witnesses.

We have then a group of witnesses, a herald, and a priest. They must all have been recruited when the intercessor declared his purpose to the two entities, which are doubtless quartered in the agora.⁵² The witnesses will represent the community at large. The place to look for them is at the second entity, called τριφυλία “body of three tribes.” These will be the three Dorian tribes or possibly the three tribes of Demonax’ reform (Hdt. 4.161.3)—either will be old custom, since Aristotle says that the number of tribes at Cyrene was afterwards increased (Pol. 6.4, 1319b 23-24). We may suppose that the tribes of old come forward in symbolic fashion on certain public occasions. The four Ionian tribes do so at Athens, and the four *basileis* “kings” who head the tribes have their own joint quarters, called the *basileion* “place of the kings”—it might be either a room or a building (Poll. 8.11).⁵³ At Cyrene the *triphylia* seems to correspond as joint quarters of the three *phylai*. Here one will find the truest representatives of the community.

The herald and the priest are probably to be sought at the first entity, which only half survives, [...(.)]πολίαν. At least six restorations are on offer, but none has gained acceptance.⁵⁴ Half of

them are a purported compound of *πόλις*, for the usual assumption is that the first entity, like the second, will be a civic body, collective or presiding. The assumption is unfounded. And the second element of such a compound is normally *-πολις*.⁵⁵ Though we cannot safely say that a compound of *πόλις* with the ending *-πολία* is impossible, there is no reason to invent such a word.⁵⁶ On any view, the first entity is naturally taken as the abstract form of a compound of *-πολος*, a large class of concrete nouns denoting a person engaged in some standard activity. The scope for conjecture would be large as well, except that we are focused on the herald and the priest. The entity is likely to be *ἱεραπολία* “office of chief priest.”

The full procedure has two stages, purification and sacrifice. In the first stage, the intercessor seats the suppliant on the threshold of the sanctuary, on a fleece, and washes and anoints him. The witnesses go out to the public street and keep silent. The great sanctuary can be reached by one street only, a processional way descending from the city farther east. The witnesses station themselves here, at the threshold, to observe the purification. The injunction “go out to the public street” may summon them either from the city or from the interior of the sanctuary if they have already rendezvoused.

At Lindus, the part of the decree that is lost may or may not have mentioned briefly the means of purifying a suppliant; the decree only regulates once more a traditional matter that was perhaps the subject of a *νόμος* “law” referred to in the second penalty clause.⁵⁷ At Athens, the excerpt from *The Traditions of the Eupatridae* mentions the washing but not the fleece or the anointing (*FGrH* 356 F 1).⁵⁸ “Then, after you [sing.] and the others partaking of the organs have washed yourselves, get water and purify [sing.]. Wash off [sing.] the blood from the person being purified.”⁵⁹ We see that a piglet has been slaughtered so as to sprinkle the suppliant with blood; at Cyrene this powerful detergent is omitted while the fleece and the oil are added. The injunctions just quoted are addressed to a person who corresponds to the intercessor at Cyrene and Lindus, presumably a member of the “Eupatridae.” The first injunction also mentions a group of persons who may correspond to the witnesses at Cyrene. And they are to dine on the spitted and roasted organs, the delectable beginning of every banquet sacrifice.⁶⁰ After the purification comes a sacrifice.

The suppliant is bidden to “go on [into the sanctuary] . . . [for the sacrifices],” the second stage. The verb *παρίμεν* denotes an advance, as into a building (*LSJs.v.* III 1); here the advance is into the sanctuary where sacrifice will be offered.⁶¹ The phrase at the end of this clause, if rightly restored, looks forward to “sacrifices” in the plural, but other words may have stood here. “Those following” can only be the same

group as before, the witnesses. While in the street, they obey the herald; now they appear to move on and to accompany the suppliant into the sanctuary.⁶² It is the suppliant who *θυσεῖ θύῃ*, since there is not room for a different subject, such as a priest. The verb form might be either future indicative as an injunction or aorist subjunctive in a temporal clause, but since he sacrifices “cakes,” a preliminary offering, I have chosen the latter.⁶³ The sacrifice of some animal victim was prescribed next and no doubt last. The third rule was probably no longer, or not much, than the first and second, respectively 11 lines and 10 lines. The following line, almost illegible, makes 10 lines.

At Lindus, a sacrifice is implied by “the priests,” who are named beside “the heralds.” At Athens, the excerpt from *The Traditions of the Eupatridae* ends with the words “And after the washing off, stir and blend together [sing.].” The directive is for a libation, perhaps the standard *melikraton* (milk, honey, and water). Libation is preliminary to sacrifice. As we saw, sacrifice is presupposed by the mention of dining on organs.

Purification and sacrifice are also conjoined in literary references.

An exiled homicide on returning to Athens is obliged to *θύσαι καὶ καθαρθῆναι* “sacrifice and be purified” (Dem. 23 *Aristocr.* 72); the order of words need not be the order in time. Plato in his legislation for a Cretan city forbids a homicide, until he is purified, to *εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ . . . πορεύεσθαι καὶ θύειν* “make his way to the shrines and sacrifice” (Leg. 9, 866 a). The purification of Achilles as an episode of the *Aethiopis* is thus summarized by Proclus: “on sacrificing (*θύσας*) to Apollo and Artemis and Leto he is purified (*καθαίρεται*) of murder by Odysseus” (*Chrest.* 172 Severyns). I translate so as to show that the participle may express the leading circumstance of the purification.⁶⁴

It is a pity that the last lines of the rule, whether one or two or three lines, are lost. They might have elaborated on the subheading, “slaying with one’s own hand.” Or they might not have, if the manner of doing so was self-evident. At Selinus the term “slaying with one’s own hand” is used of propitiating an *elasteros* because true hospitality requires it, slaying the animal oneself; the manner of doing so is self-evident. At the very end, however, an extra detail is contrived. One sacrifices as if to a god on high, an Olympian, but one also soaks the earth with blood, as if the *elasteros* were here as well; it is an expressive way of honoring a power of lightning. At Cyrene, one slays the animal with one’s own hand to demonstrate one’s entire worthiness to sacrifice; the manner of doing so is again self-evident. But there is still room to elaborate. A group of persons are on hand to witness the sacrifice, just as they witnessed the purification. It would

be pertinent to say that the meat must be properly distributed. Perhaps the last surviving line referred to this with the words
τὰ δ]ε μῆ[ρια.

1. Parker (1983, 347–51) sums up opinion to the time of writing.

2. Stukeley (1937). Parker (1983, 348–49) so regards the first kind of *hikesios* but not the second or third, and Lupu (2005, 279, 283–84) agrees. Is this a possible use of language? How did Cyrenaean readers know that the same word bears different meanings in three coordinate expressions? Which meaning does it bear in the common heading?

3. Burkert (1992, 192n31, 193n40; 2000, 209, 215III0, 216nn12–13); JJK 54–55, 76, 119; Dubois (1995a, 560–62; 1995b, 139–43); Kotansky (1995, 247–48); Clinton (1996, 175–76, 179); Cordano (1996, 140); B. Jordan (1996, 327–28); North (1996, 295, 297–98); Manganaro (1997, 563); Dobias-Lalou (1997); Giuliani (1998, 6870, 73–74, 76–78, 82, 85–87); Johnston (1999, 58–61); Lupu (2005, 280–81, 380–81, 383).

4. They have not appeared at Cyrene, but *LGPN* IIIA shows them well represented in Dorian Sicily. The noun was already used as a name in Mycenaean (KN B 799, *i-ke-ta*).

5. So Wilamowitz (1927, 167). Servais (1960, 121) further holds that the

substantive use is uniquely attested by Hsch. *ἰκέσιος ἰκέτης, πρόσφυγος, ὥς ἱερὸν καταφεύγων δοῦλος.* But this is only to gloss the less familiar adjective by the more familiar noun, not to say that the adjective functions as a noun.

6. E.g. *SEG* 26.449, “ca. 475–450 b.c.,” and *SEG* 40.334, “ca. 500–480 b.c.,” suppliants at Epidaurus and Mycenae; *IG* 4.1² 121.23, 72, 90, the record of cures at Epidaurus; *SEG* 39.729 = Kontorini (1989, 17–29 no. 1), an early Hellenistic decree of Lindus expressly dealing with the treatment of suppliants.

7. The genitive form *Διοηικέτα* at Sparta. *IG* 5.1.700. is naturally taken

as “suppliant Zeus,” especially since it is followed by *Διολευθερί[ο* “Zeus of the free.” A rival view makes it a personal name. In any case, it is another instance of

ἰκέτας in the Dorian domain.

8. Most fully, Parker (1983, 349), Burkert (1992, 70), Lupu (2005, 383). Stukeley (1937, 42–43) thinks rather of “gods of suppliants” who are “evil divinities.” Johnston (1999, 59) discerns both a ghost and “a ghost deputizing some sort of agent ... to work on his behalf.”

9. Cf. *ἐντόφιον, ἐντόφια* (lines 48, 50).

10. The term is used by Ferri (1927) (the first publication), Luzzatto (1936), and many since (sometimes in French or English forms); it is only less common than *lex sacra*.

11. Only Cassella (1997) departs from any kind of purification. She holds that ? *πακτος* is commonly used with the special sense of a “foreign” or “extraneous” element in some acknowledged entity, which in this case must be understood as a kinship group, *genos*, with its admission procedure here outlined.

12. Attempts to get round this are strained. Wilamowitz (1927, 168–69) speaks of “very ancient conditions” in which almost everyone was the dependent of a lord

or of a lady (such as Penelope or Pheretima) and could not start anew without being released from his former dependence (as if the custom or sentence of exile had not released him). De Sanctis (1927, 201–203) distinguishes between the sender, a patron of the suppliant, and the person being invoked and placated, an injured victim of the suppliant.

13. For Stukeley (1937, 35), Parker (1983, 347–48), Clinton (1996, 175), Dobias-Lalou (1997, 268), and Johnston (1999, 58–59), *ἐπακτός* means precisely “sent by spells,” but for Burkert (1992, 69–70; 2000, 209) “sent from elsewhere.”

14. E.g. *ἔρδεται, σπένδεται, παιανίζεται* “there is a sacrificing,” “a pouring of libation,” “a chanting of ‘paean’” (cf. Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 2.239–40).

15. The words *αἰ δὲ καὶ τεθνάκηι ἔγγαιος ἢ ἄλλῃ πῇ ἀπολώληι* are generally taken to mean “if he has died in the land (or in his land) or has perished somewhere else,” i.e. as referring to the place of death. For such a meaning one expects the aorist rather than the perfect and a different

location: although *ἔγγαιος* can mean *within the land* as applied to a native or local person or thing (*LSJ* s.v. 11–2), it would be very odd as a predicate adjective defining the place of death. The only meaning that fits is “in or below the earth, *χθόνιος*” (*LSJ* s.v. IV); it refers to the condition of a dead man, one buried in a grave.

16. In curse tablets found in graves, the intention is often for the victim to be rendered dumb and inert like the corpse. In just a few instances of the late fourth and the third centuries, the dead man is expressly recruited by the promise of offerings to seize and afflict the victim, just like a *nekydaimon* of the papyri (see Bravo [1987] for a full treatment). Only with an agent so recruited is it desirable that death be premature or, even better, sudden and violent. And then a curse tablet must often have been left not in a grave but in places where it did not survive or cannot be recovered.

17. Plato is not remote from the Dorian belief of this subsection (we shall see that it is Dorian). He visited Cyrene as a young man, if we may trust the report, and came to know Syracuse from visiting three times. In his eighth letter—like the seventh, generally taken as authentic—he describes Spartan institutions in an

extended metaphor taken from Dorian magic: (Lycurgus) *φάρμακον ἐπήνεγκεν τὴν τῶν γερόντων ἀρχὴν καὶ τὴν* (Wilamowitz [1919, 2.410]: *τὸν* codd.) *τῶν ἐφόρων, δεσμὸν τῆς*

βασιλικῆς ἀρχῆς σωτήριον (*Ep.* 8, 354 b 6). Lycurgus, that is to say, anointed and tied his saving devices (cf. notes 29–30 on the language of some Dorian tablets).

18. As to the term *kolossoi* see chapter 18, note 16.

19. In line 9 *ἐρεῖσες* means “put up” the money for a supply of wood, and elsewhere it means “put up” a wager, an idiomatic and unrelated use.

20. Graf (1997, 209) unwarrantably holds that the figurines “are made of unburnt clay so that they will not last very long, as the rite expects.” Either wood or clay is as durable as any material that we might expect to hear of.

21. Stukeley (1937, 33–38), while supposing that the house is assailed by a *hikesios*, rightly says that “the householder [at Cyrene] is in fundamentally the same

position as the Superstitious Man” vis-a-vis Hecate.

22. Both *ἐπαγωγή* 4 b and Rev. Suppl. *ἐπαγωγή* 3 b err in making *Ἐκάτης*

a genitive of the subject rather than the object.

23. It is an Athenian custom referred to by Aristophanes and Demosthenes but very insufficiently explained by later commentators (Apollodorus *FGrH* 244 F 109 assigns it to the first of the month). For a recent discussion see Johnston (1991, 219–21).

24. See Rohde (1925, 297–99, 590–95).

25. Sophron fr. 4 K-A consists of frs. a-d of PSI 1214. The undoubted (or nearly so) remnant of *Women Who Say They'll Drive Out the Goddess* is fr. a, ending with line 24; the name *Mormolyka* appears in fr. b at line 27.

26. Latte (1933, 262) adduces fr. 115 K-A, unassigned, about burning incense: perhaps it was burnt when the swarm had gone.

27. Plato in the *Laws* calls for the purification of a house in what seems a remote contingency: when a newly purchased slave proves to be a murderer, and this was not disclosed, the seller must purify the house of the buyer (11, 916c). Is it by way of correcting the usual superstition?

28. The only physical action so employed is *κατάδεσις* “tving down.” For global references see Pl. *Resp.* 2. 364 c (*ἐπαγωγή, κατάδεσμος*), *Leg.*

11, 933 d (*κατάδεσις, ἐπαγωγή, ἐπωιδή*), *Luc.* 36 *De merc. cond.*

40 Macleod (*ἐπαγωγή*). To call dogs on the quarry is a similar use of

ἐπάγω, ἐπακτήρ; magic and hunting are both furious endeavors. It may be worth complaining that *LSJ* s. *ἐπάγω, ἐπακτός* does not register the magical sense at all.

29. *IvKnidos* 154.14–16 *εἴ τι ἢ ἐμοὶ πεποίκει φάρμ[ακον]*

ἢ ποτὸν ἢ καταχριστὸν ἢ ἐπακτὸν [ἢ τινι] ἡμῶν “if he has contrived against me any *pharmakon* either to be drunk or to be anointed or to be conjured, or against any of us.”

30. Phalasarna: *ICret* 2 xix 7 / D. R. Jordan (1992) / Furley (1993, 96–99) / Brixhe and Panayotou (1995) / *Orph.* fr. 830c Bernabe, line 11

ο με καταχρισ[...]. ἡλησεται οὔτε ἐπηνικτω[.]

οὔτε πατω ο[...]. πατω γηι σ[...]. τορα πάντων α[.] After Maas (1944) and Jordan (2000, 99), this may be in part restored, in part interpreted, as two hexameter lines:

οὔ με καταχριστ[ῶι δ] ἡλήσεται<α>

οὔτε ἐπ<ε>νικτῶ[ι] / οὔτε ποτῶι οὔτ' ἐπαγωγῇ,

σ[ῖν]τορ ἀπάντων. Locri: Jordan (2000, 96–101) = *Orph.* fr. 830e Bernabe. Himera: *Orph.* fr. 830f Bernabe. Selinus: cf. Jordan (2000, 96n10).

31. Dickie (2001, 48) thinks of “specialists” of some kind, “some of whom moved from place to place.”

32. Yet another proposal, barely inchoate, can be confined to this note. The

term *τελεσφορία* happens to be variously used of ritual in three Cyrenaean cults, of Demeter, Apollo, and Artemis. It seems variously suited to deities who “bring fulfillment” at the harvest and at the maturity of young men and young women. But some “suspect a connection” (Parker) with our rule: Servais (1960, 137n1), Parker (1983, 349), Dobias-Lalou (1997, 265; 2000, 209—II).

33. First proposed by Wilamowitz, often adopted since, as by Parker (1983, 349—50)—he does not in fact mention any other view.

34. First proposed by Luzzatto, adopted with extreme hesitation by Servais (1960, 130—39).

35. Sokolowski (1954, 176—77), as part of a dubious account of “sacral manumission.”

36. Sokolowski on *LS Suppl.* 115 B 40—49 (Paris 1962, p. 195).

37. Stukey (1937, 41—42).

38. Burkert (1992, 70—71, 193).

39. The form *τελσκεσθαι* is sometimes rendered as a passive, “is initiated,” sometimes as a middle, “pays.” For the latter meaning, not included in *LSJ*, see Wilamowitz (1927, 170), Sokolowski *ad loc.*, Dobias-Lalou (1997, 265—66), Rigsby (2000, 102).

40. The meaning “pay” is common in documents and in the orators but is implicit also in some early instances: Waanders (1983, 227—28).

41. Ritual texts not infrequently use a dangling nominative participle beside infinitives: Scullion (1998, 117—18). With a different punctuation the phrase further describes “*hikesios* the second” as “sitting” etc. (chapter 17, p. 275).

42. A suppliant, to be sure, also sits at his place of refuge, and the detail is so interpreted by Wilamowitz (1927, 169—70) and Servais (1960, 131—32).

43. See Stucchi (1975, 56—57; 1981), Ensoli Vittozzi (1996, 87), *Cirene* 124 (S. Ensoli and C. Parisi Presicce).

44. The injunction *θυσεῖ... ἐπὶ τὸμ πατρῶιον* is similar to the iniunctions of the tithing rules. *ἐπιθησεῖ ... ἐπὶ τὸ σᾶμα* (line 55),

οὐδὲ θυσεῖ οὐδ' ἐπὶ τὸ σᾶμα εἴτι (lines 56—57), also

ἐντόφιον οὐκ ἐνθήσει κτλ (lines 48—49, cf. 50). That this is a tomb is generally agreed, though why it figures is not. For various opinions see Wilamowitz (1927, 169—70), Stukey (1937, 41), Sokolowski (1954, 177), Servais (1960, 138), Parker (1983, 349), Burkert (1992, 70—71), Dobias-Lalou (1997, 266).

45. A killer by his own hand: Servais (1960, 140). Any homicide: Parker (1983, 350—51).

46. Homicide victim: Stukey (1937, 38—40). Suicide: Burkert (1992, 72, 193nn42—43) (he understands the rule to say that his corpse is first seated and then buried).

47. Kontorini (1989, 17—29 no. 1) = *SEG* 39.729; cf. Kontorini (1987).

48. Referring to the suppliant: Schlesinger (1933, 51—52), Servais (1960, 140—41). Referring to an intercessor: Wilamowitz (1927, 171—72), Latte (1928, 48), Stukey (1937, 39), Parker (1983, 350), Kontorini (1989, 22—24), Dobias-Lalou (1997, 266—67; 2000, 211—12, 306—7; 2001, 619—23).

49. At Lindus the terms *ἀφικετεύων* and *δεκόμενος* are coordinate.

The supplement *ἰκέλ-/σθαι* has been standard; see as the latest Dobias-Lalou (1997, 263, 267; 2000, 302; 2001, 263). It would mean either “when (the

intercessor) announces that (a suppliant) has come” or “when (the suppliant) announces that he has come.” In the first case, the infinitive is too cryptic. In the second, the subject changes abruptly from ἀφικετεύειν and will change again with ἴσσαντα.

50. So Kontorini (1989, 24–25), followed by Dobias-Lalou (1997, 267). And so, too, as Kontorini observes, Latte (1928, 49–50) and Servais (1960, 146), without using the word “herald.”

51. τοὶ δὲ ἱερεῖς ἢ τοὶ κάρ[υκες] “the priests or the heralds” (SEG 39.729 lines 7–11). Cf. Kontorini (1989, 25–26).

52. It would be fanciful, however, to suggest any definite location in the agora, the more so since the use of several buildings is quite unknown. The south side of the square is taken up by two large buildings of similar form, a peristyle court and rooms, one of them perhaps the attested *prytaneion*. It is in the other, at the east, that Stucchi (1975, 66–67) locates the [*arche*]polia (so Oliverio) and the *triphylia*. Laronde (1987, 178) quite reasonably objects.

53. On the Ionian tribes in Athenian ceremony, see Robertson (1992, 36–38, 58–61, 63–64, 71–81; 1998b, 111–12); on the *basileion*, Robertson (1992, 80–81; 1998b, 113–14).

54. [τρι]πολίαν, [ἐπι]πολίαν, [ἀρχε]πολίαν, [δικασ]πολίαν, [θυη]πολίαν, [ἄλλο]πολίαν. The last we owe to Burkert (1992, 193n43); it is commended as one of three possibilities by Rhodes and Osborne, *GHI* no. 97 p. 500, but I do not know what meaning he or they intend. Whereas ἄλλοπολία means “alien residency” in Cretan inscriptions, Burkert offers his conjecture in a note attached to the phrase “a marginal region where ‘three tribes meet’ (*triphylia*)” occurring on p. 72.

55. So Masson (1970, 233), Laronde (1987, 178), Dobias-Lalou (2000, 237).

56. A compound of this kind does not otherwise exist. Linguists are inadvertent in treating ἄλλοπολία as a compound of πόλις: so Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 1.439 n. 5, Chantraine, Dobias-Lalou (2000, 237). The sense can only be “elsewhere-dwelling,” < πέλομαι, as that of ἀστυπολία is “town-dwelling” (Hierocl. *Elem. Mor.* p. 62 von Arnim = Stob. *Anth.* 4.28.21, where the context bears out the meaning very plainly). Understandably, the secondary term ἄλλοπολιάτας agrees with πολιάτας; *ἄλλοπόλος would have sounded quaint, evoking poetic words in -πόλος. The compound πολιανομέω follows some other analogy.

57. See Kontorini (1989, 25–27).

58. The title τὰ τῶν Εὐπατριδῶν πάτρια occurs only at Ath. 9.78, 410a, a citation by the grammarian Dorotheus. In fact, the name is corrupted to θυγατριδῶν : Εὐπατριδῶν K. O. Müller, Θυργωνιδῶν Adam, Φυταλιδῶν Lobeck. Muller’s correction can be accepted as coming closest and as suiting the prominence of *Eupatridae* in the Roman period, when these traditions were very likely published: cf. Jacoby (1949, 27–28). In early days various *gene* conducted purifications, as we see chiefly from aetiological stories, in which homicide, of course, is to the fore. The story and iconography of Heracles’

purification at the Lesser Mysteries give us a procedure close to this one, but

Εὐμολπιδῶν cannot be entertained in Athenaeus.

59. Parker (1983, 371n9; cf. 134III19) errs in saying that the purifying ritual is “associated with blood,” i.e. with homicide. Athenaeus cites both Cleidemus’ *Exêgêtikon* and *The Traditions of the Eupatridae* to illustrate washing as purification (9.78, 409f—10b = *FGrH* 323 F 14, 356 F 1). The former speaks of the cult of the

dead, and the latter of the treatment of suppliants, *περὶ τῆς τῶν ἱκετῶν καθάρσεως*, unrestricted.

60. These organs do not come from the piglet slaughtered for the bloody sprinkling; the animal is much too small. That they come from the piglet or another victim so used is wrongly maintained by Tresp (1914, 41—42), Rudhardt (1958, 271), Burkert (1992, 211), JJK 74—75. Burkert says further of the words quoted, “it shows that sacrifice is going on.” It shows rather that a banquet sacrifice occurs at some point.

61. The supplement *[ρα· ἐς ἰα/ρό]ν* is nearly certain.

62. Wilamowitz (1927, 170–71) supplies the opposite sense, *ἀναμένειν ἐξοῖ* “wait outside,” but this they would do unless directed otherwise.

63. As to the verb form, Wilamowitz and others supply and translate as if it were future indicative; the accent should then be *θυσεῖ*. Wilamowitz renders *θύη* as “incense,” but the usual meaning is “cakes,” as demonstrated by Casabona (1966, 112–13). In adducing our inscription, Casabona offers the suitable

ἄλλα [τὰ νομιζόμενα]. supplement
Stengel (1920, 101). Cakes are often a preliminary offering:

64. But Stengel (1920, 157) tenaciously infers from the aorist participle that Achilles, even while tainted by homicide, “could take part in acts of worship and approach the gods like anyone else.”

Cyrene, c. 335-324 B.C.

The Inscription

The same marble block in Apollo's sanctuary was shared by our inscription and by the list of shipments of grain during the famine years, c. 330-325 B.c.¹ The list was inscribed at the end of this period, compiled as it seems from the records of several years, "when the famine occurred in Greece" (lines 3-4).² The shipments went to forty-one Greek cities and also Epeirus, then the domain of Olympias and Cleopatra.³ They are registered in descending order of size, and for several cities amounts are entered twice where they belong in the scale, doubtless representing different years. This refinement is surprising when large round numbers predominate.⁴ Athens has a single entry for the largest amount, but famine is documented here in both 330/29 and 328/7; at other places other years would be acute, depending on local weather and supply; price inflation was more continuous and created need as well. It seems likely that shipments took place every year for several years over similar routes. The arrangement is artificial, as if to show that Cyrene provided universal relief according to need.

The grain was produced and sold by the owners of Cyrene's rich agricultural land. Perhaps they were allied with merchants of Rhodes whose customary routes ran through the Cretan cities and Aegean islands named as receiving shipments; these places make up a disproportionate number.⁵ The Cyrenaean landowners were a ruling oligarchy, and the list is a proud advertisement of their wealth and power and goodness.

The list as a single column and columns A and B of our sacred rules occupy three faces of the marble block proceeding from right to left. The fourth face was left unfinished and perhaps abutted on a wall. The lettering of the two inscriptions is very similar, that of the list being somewhat larger and more deeply and finely cut.

Opinion is not agreed as to which was first inscribed, the list or

the rules.⁶ If the block stood out from a wall, perhaps the rules were inscribed first on the front and on one side, to be followed by the list on the other side. But if it was expected anyway that the three faces would be filled up by inscriptions, it was natural to inscribe the right side first, with the list. It also seems quite possible that the list and the rules are contemporary—that they were entrusted to different hands, and the list was done more carefully just because it is much briefer. However this may be, both the list and the rules are documents of the same oligarchy, displayed together for similar purposes. For the inscribing of the rules, either before or after the list, the outside limits are c. 335-324 b.c. We shall see next why the lower limit is precise.

The Background

Of government and society at Cyrene at this time and for long before, only a little is definitely known. In 401 b.c. we find the city torn by civil strife (Diod. 14.34.3-6; cf. Paus. 4.26.2). Many of the wealthy were killed, and the others driven out, and a certain Ariston and others held power until the exiles were strengthened by a band of roving Messenians, and a battle was fought in which many died on both sides, including most of the Messenians. The upshot was that the two sides reconciled and agreed to live together. They must have agreed upon a moderate democracy, a less exclusive regime than when the wealthy became so hated. Thereafter, sometime in the first half of the fourth century, Therans residing at Cyrene were granted equal rights by a decree of the *dêmos*, a democratic assembly (Meiggs and Lewis, *GHI* 5 lines 3-4, 11).

But Ptolemy's *diagramma* of 321 b.c. shows that an oligarchy of "the Thousand" was previously in power, now to be replaced by a broader oligarchy of "the Ten Thousand" (*SEG* 9.1, 18.726). How and when the change occurred from moderate democracy to oligarchy is hard to say.⁷ The oligarchy was firmly in control during the famine years and for a year or two after. Ptolemy intervened during a sudden convulsion of war and civil strife that was caused entirely by Thibron of Sparta, a military leader seeking a kingdom of his own.

It is true that Thibron was incited by Cyrenaean exiles who sought him out, probably in Crete, after he murdered Harpalus and seized what remained of his treasure.⁸ Thibron arrived in Libya in 324/3 and attacked Cyrene. But the sequel shows that the exiles did not represent any considerable group within the city, whether oligarchs or democrats. Cyrene resisted stoutly in a long-drawn struggle remarkable for sudden reversals on either side (so Diodorus, following Hieronymus, it is thought).⁹

Thibron at once defeated the Cyrenaean in the field, inflicting

heavy losses, and seized the port of Apollonia, but he could not take the city by assault. Instead, one of his lieutenants defected, the port was recovered, and the offensive passed briefly to the Cyrenaeans. Thibron was reinforced by mercenaries from Taenarum, and the war grew even fiercer until the Cyrenaeans lost a hard-fought battle in which all their generals were killed. It was only now, when the city, like the port, was invested by the enemy, and food ran short, that *δημοτικοί* and *κτηματικοί*, democrats and oligarchs, turned against each other. The democrats won out, and some oligarchs fled to Thibron, others to Ptolemy. Ptolemy dispatched his general Ophellas, who quickly decided the matter. Cyrene and its large territory passed into the hands of Ptolemy, and he issued the *diagramma* outlining the form of government to be adopted.¹⁰

Ptolemy's control was light enough at first for Cyrene to revolt briefly in 313 b.c. But our inscription cannot be assigned to the period 321-313. It refers only in the broadest terms to the threat of "sickness or [famine] or death" and envisages only normal conditions and customary undertakings. The upheaval and suffering and destruction of the war with Thibron are not just behind.

So the inscription belongs to the oligarchy and the years between c. 335 and 324, a time when the city was peaceful and secure. The oligarchy made it so; the rules are devised to this end.

1. The list is published from the stone by Ferri (1925, 24-26), Oliverio (1933, 29-35), and Laronde (1987, 30-33) ("revision in April 1973, squeeze").

2. It is sometimes thought that Macedon directed a relief effort or was courted by Cyrene; against this, see Rhodes and Osborne, *GEI* 96.

3. The ethnic names to be read at lines 15 and 16 are very much in doubt, and the sense of those at lines 54 and 58 has been so too, but all of them are likely to be Greek cities rather than any larger entity, except for Ceos in line 53, the several cities being indicated elsewhere. Tenos cannot take the form partially read in line 15; Lesbos with several important cities cannot be the subject of a compendious reference in line 16; *Ἰλυρίους* in line 54 is not the nation Illyria but Elyrus in Crete, joining other Cretan cities; *Ἰκετυρίους* in line 58 remains enigmatic. See Brun (1993, 186-89).

4. Were the available records sufficient for the implied arrangement? Two different amounts are registered for seven cities and for Olympias, as if referring to different years; three different amounts are registered for Epeirus if Olympias and Cleopatra are interchangeable. The smaller of two amounts for Ambracia and Cnossus are much the smallest in the list, 1,500 and 900 *medimnoi*, except for 1,000 *medimnoi* sent to *Ἰκετυρίοι*. Athens, at the top of the list, receives 100,000 *medimnoi*, the cargo of many ships, all at once. Surely this and other large amounts, as of 60,000 and 50,000 *medimnoi*, are not the record of a single year; surely the larger figures should not all of them be quite so round. Furthermore, an instance of 60,000 *medimnoi* for Olympias contrasts with one of 2,600; there is also one of 50,000 for Cleopatra. The distinction between the two dynasts has not been explained. Perhaps the names or the order of names differed on different bills of lading and led to an

arbitrary rendering.

5. So Brun (1993, 190–95).

6. The documents are always treated separately, giving no occasion to discuss the matter. Wilamowitz (1927, 155, 174) was wrong to assign the rules, by contrast with the list, to the time of “the first Ptolemies.” Laronde (1987, 30) regards the list of shipments as “the latest, slightly,” of the three inscribed faces, but does not explain.

7. Laronde (1987, 249–52) argues for c. 370–360 B.c.

8. The identity of the exiles is discussed by Laronde (1987, 41–42, 69–70, 76, 252–53). He regards them as “moderates,” i.e. moderate oligarchs or aristocrats somehow representing the earlier moderate regime, and also thinks that they were readmitted to the city after Thibron’s initial victory in the field. Both points are conjectural.

9. The war with Thibron is known from Diod. 18.19–21, Arr. *Suce. FGrH* 156 F 9 = Phot. *Bibi.* 92 §§16–17, Just. 13.6.20, *Marm. Par.* 239 B 10–11. That Hieronymus is a principal source of Diodorus and Arrian is agreed; another source is evident but contributes little, as shown by Hornblower (1981, 51–53, 122) and again by Laronde (1987, 43–44).

10. The *diagramma* is undated, but it was needed at once, and it makes special provision for “the exiles who have fled to Egypt.” Most now agree on 321 B.c; Laronde (1987, 85–128) discusses the careers and connections of the Cyrenaicans named as magistrates.

References

- Amandry, P. 1950. *La mantique apollinienne a Delphes*. Paris.
- Amigues, S. 1989. "Appendice." *RevPhil* 63: 65-66 (further to Masson [1989]).
- Amyx, D. A. 1958. "The Attic Stelai, Part iii: Vases and Other Containers." *Hesperia* 27: 163-307.
- Arena, R. 1997. JJK reviewed. *PP* 52: 428-39.
- Arena, R. 1999. "Interferenze linguistiche e grafiche nell'epigrafia greca della Sicilia." In M. I. Gulletta, ed., *Sicilia epigraphica: Atti del convegno di studi, Erice, 15-18 Ottobre 1998*, 47-51. Pisa.
- Arnold-Biucchi, C. 1992. "The Beginnings of Coinage in the West: Archaic Selinus." In H. Nilsson, ed., *Florilegium numismaticum: Studia in honorem U. Westermark edita*, 13-19. Stockholm.
- Arvanitopoulos, A. S. 1929. "Ἡ θροοσία Ἀρτεμις τῶν Λαρισαίων καὶ αἱ νεβεύσανσαι." *Polemon* 1: 249-51.
- Avram, A. 2002. "Der dionysische 'Thiasos' in Kallatis: Organisation, Repräsentation, Funktion." In U. Egelhaaf-Gaiser and A. Schafer, eds., *Religiöse Vereine in der römischen Antike*, 69-80. Tübingen.
- Bacchielli, L. 1990. "I 'luoghi' della celebrazione politica e religiosa a Cirene." In B. Gentile, ed., *Cirene: Storia, mito, letteratura*, 21-33. Urbino.
- Bacchielli, L. 1996. "La tomba di Batto su alcune monete di Cirene." In L. Bacchielli and M. Bonanno Arvantinos, eds., *Scritti di antichità in memoria di S. Stucchi*, 1.15-20. Rome.
- Bergquist, B. 2005. "A Re-study of Two Thasian Instances of ἐνατεύειν." In R. Hagg and B. Alroth, eds., *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian*, 61-70. Stockholm.
- Bernabe, A. 1999. "La laminetta orfica di Entella." In M. I. Gulletta, ed., *Sicilia epigraphica: Atti del convegno di studi, Erice, 15-18 Ottobre 1998*, 53-63. Pisa.
- Bernabé, A. 2000. "Nuovi frammenti orfici e una nuova edizione degli Orfika." In M. Tortorelli Ghidini, A. Storch Marino, and A. Visconti, eds., *Tra Orfeo e Pitagora: Origini e incontri di culture nell'antichità. Atti dei seminari napoletani 1996-1998*, 43-80. Naples.
- Bernabe, A. 2002. "La theogonie orphique du papyrus de Derveni." *Kernos* 15: 91-129.
- Berthiaume, G. 1982. *Les rôles de mageiros: Etude sur la boucherie, la cuisine, et la sacrifice dans la Grece ancienne*. Leiden.
- Beschi, L. 1968. "Contributi di topografia ateniese." *ASAtene* 45-46 (n.s. 29-30): 511-36.
- Bevan, E. 1987. "The Goddess Artemis and the Dedication of Bears in Sanctuaries." *BSA* 82: 17-21.
- Bevilacqua, G., and S. Giannobile. 2000. "'Magia' rurale siciliana: Iscrizioni di Noto e Modica." *ZPE* 133: 145-46.
- Bile, C. 1988. *Le dialecte cretois ancien: Etude de la langue des inscriptions. Recueil des inscriptions postérieures aux I C*. Paris.

- Billot, M.-F. 1992. "Le Cynosarges, Antiochos et les tanneurs: Questions de topographie." *BCH* 116: 119-56.
- Bleeh, M. 1982. *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen*. Berlin.
- Blinkenberg, C. 1911. *The Thunderweapon in Religion and Folklore*. Cambridge.
- Blinkenberg, C. 1941. *Lindos: Fouilles de l'Acropole 2. Inscriptions*. Berlin.
- Boffo, L. 1996. JJK reviewed. *Athenaeum* 84: 620-21.
- Bolte, F. 1929. "Zu lakonischen Feste." *RhM* 78: 129-43.
- Bomer, F. 1961. *Untersuchungen über die Religion der Sklaven in Griechenland und Rom 3: Die wichtigsten Kulte der griechischen Welt*. AbhMainz 1961: 4.
- Bommelaer, J.-F., and J. des Courtils. 1994. *La salle hypostyle d' Argos*. Paris.
- Bookidis, N., and R.S. Stroud. 2004. "Apollo and the Archaic Temple at Corinth." *Hesperia* 73: 401-26.
- Bourriot, F. 1976. *Recherches sur la nature du genos*. Lille.
- Brandt, H. 1990. "Argos und Sikyon im Vergleich zu Athen zur Zeit Polyklets." In H. Beck, P. C. Bol, and M. Bückling, eds., *Polyklet: Der Bildhauer der griechischen Klassik*, 19-31, 507-8. Mainz.
- Brandt, H. 1992. "IG IV 554: Aus Argos oder Halieis?" *Chiron* 22: 83-90.
- Braun, J. 1932. *De Theraeorum rebus sacris*. Halle.
- Bravo, B. 1987. "Une tablette magique d'Olbia pontique, les morts, les heros, et les demons." In *Poikilia: Etudes offertes a J.-P. Vernant*, 185-218. Paris.
- Brellich, A. 1969. *Paides eparthenoi*. Rome.
- Bremmer, J. N. 2005. "The Sacrifice of Pregnant Animals." In R. Hagg and B. Alroth, eds., *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian*, 155-65. Stockholm.
- Brisson, L. 1987. "Proclus et l'orphisme." In J. Pepin and H. D. Saffrey, eds., *Proclus lecteur et interprete des anciens*, 43-104. Paris.
- Brixhe, C., and A. Panayotou. 1995. "Le plomb magique de Phalasarna (IC II-XIX 7)." *Hellenika Symmiktika* 2: 23-38.
- Brown, A. L. 1984. "Eumenides in Greek Tragedy." *CQ*, n.s., 34: 260-81.
- Brugnone, A. 1998. "Epigrafia greca." *Kokalos* 43/44: 573-605.
- Brule, P. 1987. *La fille d'Athenes*. Paris.
- Brule, P. 1997. "La Macédoine et les rites d'initiation" (Hatzopoulos 1994 reviewed). *Kernos* 7: 319-31.
- Brun, P. 1993. "La stele des cereales de Cyrene et le commerce du grain en Egee au IV^e s. av. J.C." *ZPE* 99: 185-96.
- Bruneau, P. 1970. *Recherches sur les cultes de Delos a l'époque hellénistique et a l'époque imperiale*. Paris.
- Brunel, J. 1984. "Pour une interpretation de la 'loi sacree' de Cyrene §5." *RPhil* 58: 35-44.
- Burkert, W. 1972a. *Homo Necans: Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen*. Berlin.
- Burkert, W. 1972b. *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*, trans. E. L. Minar Jr. Cambridge, Mass.
- Burkert, W. 1977. *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche*. Stuttgart.
- Burkert, W. 1992. *The Orientalizing Revolution*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Burkert, W. 1993. "Kronia-Feste und ihr altorientalischer Hintergrund." In S. Dopp, ed., *Karnevalleske Phänomene in antiken und nachantiken Kulturen und Literaturen*, 11-30. Trier.
- Burkert, W. 1999. "Von Selinus zu Aischylos: 'Reinigung' im Ritual und im Theater." *Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften: Berichte und Abhandlungen* 7: 23-38.
- Burkert, W. 2000. "Private Needs and Polis Acceptance: Purification at Selinous." In P. Flensted-Jensen, T. H. Nielsen, and L. Rubinstein, eds., *Polis and Politics*:

- Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to M. H. Hansen, 207-16. Copenhagen.
- Cadoux, C. J. 1938. *Ancient Smyrna*. Oxford.
- Calame, C. 1977. *Les chœurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque*. Rome.
- Calhoun, G. M. 1934. "Lex Sacra Cyrenaica." *CP* 29: 345-46.
- Camassa, G. 1999. "La 'lex sacra' di Selinunte." In M. I. Gulletta, ed., *Sicilia epigraphica: Atti del convegno di studi, Erice, 15-18 ottobre 1998*, 141-48. Pisa.
- Carlier, P. 1984. *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*. Paris.
- Casabona, J. 1966. *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec*. Aix-en-Provence.
- Cassella, P. 1997. "Sulla semantica di ἑπακτός e ἰκέσιος ἑπακτός della *Lex Cathartica* di Cirene." *AttiAccPontaniana*, n.s. 46: 333-48.
- Chamoux, P. 1953. *Cyrene sous la monarchie des Battiades*. Paris.
- Chamoux, P. 1988. "Les comptes des demiurges a Cyrene." In D. Knoepfler, ed., *Comptes et inventaires dans la cite grecque*, 143-54. Neuchatel.
- Chaniotis, A. 1996. *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Städte in der hellenistischen Zeit*. Stuttgart.
- Chaniotis, A. 2002. "Some Cretan Bastards." *Cretan Studies* 7: 51-57.
- Chantraine, P. 1956. "Μητρός ἐν Ἀγῶας." *Cl&M* 17: 1-4.
- Chantraine, P. 1966. "Questions de syntaxe grecque I: Encore ἐν Ἀγῶας." *RPh* 92: 37-39.
- Cirene, ed. N. Bonacasa and S. Ensoli. 2000. Milan.
- Clement, P. 1934. "New Evidence for the Origin of the Iphigeneia Legend." *AntClass* 3: 393-409.
- Clinton, K. 1974. *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Philadelphia.
- Clinton, K. 1996. "A New Lex Sacra from Selinus: Kindly Zeuses, Eumenides, Impure and Pure Tritopatores, and Elasteroi." *CP* 91: 159-79.
- Clinton, K. 2005. "Pigs in Greek Rituals." In R. Hagg and B. Alroth, eds., *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian*, 167-79. Stockholm.
- Cole, S. G. 1988. "The Uses of Water in Greek Sanctuaries." In R. Hagg, N. Marinatos, and G. C. Nordquist, eds., *Early Greek Cult Practice*, 161-65. Stockholm.
- Cole S. G. 1998. "Domesticating Artemis." In S. Blundell and M. Williamson, eds., *The Sacred and the Feminine in Ancient Greece*, 27-43. London.
- Cole, S. G. 2004. *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space*. Berkeley.
- Cook, A. B. 1914. *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion* 1. Cambridge.
- Cook, A. B. 1925. *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion* 2. Cambridge.
- Cook, A. B. 1940. *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion* 3. Cambridge.
- Cordano F. 1993. "Due note adriatiche." In L. Braccisi, ed., *Hesperia* 3, 145-53. Rome.
- Cordano, F. 1996. JJK reviewed. *Aevum* 70: 137-41.
- Cordano, F. 1997. JJK reviewed. *PP* 52: 423-27.
- Culley, G. R. 1977. "The Restoration of Sanctuaries in Attica, II." *Hesperia* 46: 282-98.
- Curbera, J. B. 1998. "Onomastics and River-gods in Sicily." *Philologus* 142: 52-60.
- Curbera, J. B. 1999. "Defixiones." In M. I. Gulletta, ed., *Sicilia epigraphica: Atti del convegno di studi, Erice, 15-18 ottobre 1998*, 159-86. Pisa.
- Curti, E., and R. van Bremen. 1999. "Notes on the Lex Sacra from Selinus." *Ostraka* 8: 21-33.
- Cusumano, N. 1998. "Culti e miti." *Kokalos* 43/44: 727-811.
- Dakoronia, F., and L. Gounaropoulou. 1992. "Artemiskult auf einem neuen Weihrelief aus Achinos bei Lamia." *AthMitt* 107: 217-27.
- D'Alessio, G. B. 1996. *Callimaco*. Milan.
- Daux, G. 1963. "La grande demarchie: Un nouveau calendrier sacrificiel d'Attique

- (Erchia)." *BCH* 87: 603-34.
- Daux, G. 1964. "Notes de lecture." *BCH* 88: 676-79.
- Daux, G. 1983. "Le calendrier de Thorikos au Musee J. Paul Getty." *AntCl* 52: 150-74.
- Davies, J. K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families 600-300 b.c.* Oxford.
- De Angelis, F. 2003. *Megara Hyblaia and Selinous*. Oxford.
- de La Geniere, J. 1992. "Reflexions sur les sanctuaires de la Mere des dieux au Peloponnese." *SIFC* 10: 96-103.
- De Sanctis, G. 1927. "Epigrafica ix: Le decretali di Cirene." *RivFil*, n.s., 5: 185-212.
- de Waele, J. A. 1971. *Acragas Graeca*. 1971.
- Defradas, J. 1954. *Les themes de la propagande Delphique*. Paris.
- Dehl-von Kaenel, C. 1995. *Die archaische Keramik aus dem Malophoros- Heiligtum in Selinunt*. Berlin.
- Delos. P. Bruneau and J. Ducat, *Guide de Delos*³. 1983. Paris.
- Denniston, J. D. 1950. *The Greek Particles*², rev. K. J. Dover. Oxford.
- des Courtils, J. 1981. "Note de topographie argienne." *BCH* 105: 607-10.
- Deubner, L. 1932. *Attische Feste*. Berlin.
- Develin, R. 1989. *Athenian Officials 684-321 b.c.* Cambridge.
- Dewailly, M. 1992. *Les statuettes aux parures du sanctuaire de la Malophoros a SeElinonte*. Naples.
- Dickie, M. W. 1979. "Pindar's *Seventh Pythian* and the Status of the Alcmaeonids as *Oikos* or *Genos*." *Phoenix* 33: 193-209.
- Dickie, M. W. 1996. "What Is a *Kolossoi* and How Were *Kolossoi* Made in the Hellenistic Period?" *GRBS* 37: 237-57.
- Dickie, M. W. 2001. *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World*. London.
- Dillon, M. 2002. *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion*. London.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 1987. "Noyau grec et elements indigenes dans le dialecte cyreneen." *QuadArchLibia* 12: 85-91.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 1993. "Les depenses engagees par les demiurges de Cyrene pour les cultes." *REG* 106: 24-38.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 1996. "Le cinquieme commandement de la loi sacree de Cyrene." In L. Bacchielli and M. Bonanno Araventinis, eds., *Scritti di antichita in memoria di S. Stucchi*, 1.73-78. Rome.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 1997. "Suppliants ou revenants dans la grande loi sacree de Cyrene?" *Lalies* 17: 261-70.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 1999. Santucci 1998 reviewed (= *BE* 613). *REG* 112: 699-700.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 2000. *Le dialecte des inscriptions grecque de Cyrene*. Paris.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 2001. "ἀπικτωρ, Eschyle, *Suppliantes* 1 et 241." *REG* 114: 614-25.
- Dodds, E. R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley.
- Doepner, D. 2002. *Steine und Pfeiler für die Gotter: Weihgeschenkgattungen in westgriechischen Stadtheiligtümern*. Wiesbaden.
- Dover, K.J. 1988. "Greek homosexuality and initiation." In *The Greeks and their Legacy. Collected Papers* 2, 115-34. Oxford.
- Dowden, K. 1989. *Death and the Maiden*. London.
- Dubois, L. 1995a. JJK reviewed (= *BE* 692). *REG* 108: 556-62.
- Dubois, L. 1995b. "Une nouvelle inscription archaïque de Selinonte." *RPhil* 69: 127-44.
- Dubois, L. 1999. "La nouvelle loi sacree de Selinonte: Bilan dialectologique." In A. C. Cassio, ed., *Kata dialekon: Atti dell III Colloquio internazionale di dialettologia greca. Napoli-Fiaiano d'Ischia, 25-28. settembre 1996*, 331-46. Naples.
- Dunbabin, T. J. 1948. *The Western Greeks*. Oxford.
- Dunst, G. 1964. "Leukaspis." *BCH* 88: 482-85.
- Durand, J.-L. 1979. "Betes grecques: Propositions pour une topologie de corps a

- manger." In M. Detienne and J.-P. Vernant, eds., *La cuisine de sacrifice en pays grec*, 133-66. Paris.
- Dyck, A. R. 1989. "New Light on Greek Authors from Grammatical Texts." *MHelv* 46: 1-8.
- Eitrem, S. 1920. *Beitrage zur griechischen Religionsgeschichte* 3. Kristiania.
- Ekroth, G. 2002. *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-cults*. Liege.
- Ekroth, G. 2003. "Inventing Iphigeneia? On Euripides and the Cultic Construction of Brauron." *Kernos* 16: 59-118.
- Elderkin, G. W. 1934. "The *Curculio* of Plautus." *AJA* 38: 29-36.
- Ensolì Vittozzi, S. 1996. "I rifornimenti idrici del santuario Cireneo di Apollo dal IV secolo a. C. alla fine dell'età tolemaica." In L. Bacchielli and M. Bonanno Arvantinos, eds., *Scritti di antichità in memoria di S. Stucchi*, 79-110. Rome.
- Erbse, H. 1950. *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika*. Berlin.
- Erds, D. 2002. *Cratero il Macedone. Testimonianze e frammenti*. Rome.
- Etienne, R., and D. Knoepfler. 1976. *Hyettos de Beotie*. Paris.
- Fama, M. L. 1980. "L'area sacra con altare 'a tre betili' a Solunto." *SicArch* 12: 37-42.
- Fama, M. L., and V. Tusa. 2000. *Le stele del Melichios di Selinunte*. Padua.
- Farnell, L. R. 1921. *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*. Oxford.
- Fehling, D. 1985. *Die sieben Weisen und die frühgriechische Chronologie*. Bern.
- Fehling, D. 1989. *Herodotus and His "Sources"*. Leeds.
- Fehrle, E. 1910. *Die kultische Keuschheit im Altertum*. Giessen.
- Ferguson, W. S. 1938. "The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion." *Hesperia* 7: 1-74.
- Ferri, S. 1923. *Contributi di Cirene alla storia della religione greca*. Rome.
- Ferri, S. 1925. "Alcuni iscrizioni di Cirene." *AbhBerl* 1925: 5.
- Ferri, S. 1927. "La 'lex cathartica' di Cirene." *Notiziario Archeologico* 4: 91-145.
- Ferri, S. 1929. "Note d'epigrafia cirenaica." *Historia: Studi storici per l'antichità classica* 3, 381-400.
- Fiedler, W. 1931. *Antiker Wetterzauber*. Stuttgart.
- Fischer-Hansen, T. 2000. "Ergasteria in the Western Greek World." In P. Flensted-Jensen, T. H. Nielsen, and L. Rubinstein, eds., *Polis and Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to M. H. Hansen*, 91-120. Copenhagen.
- Foerster, R. 1874. *Der Raub und die Rückkehr der Persephone*. Stuttgart.
- Fontenrose, J. 1959. *Python. A Study of Delphic Myth and Its Origins*. Berkeley.
- Fontenrose, J. 1978. *The Delphic Oracle*. Berkeley.
- Forbes Irving, P. M. C. 1990. *Metamorphosis in Greek Myths*. Oxford.
- Forrest, W. G. 1963. "The Inscriptions of South-east Chios I." *BSA* 58: 53-67.
- Fowler, R. L. 1993. "The Myth of Kephalos as an Aition of Rain-magic." *ZPE* 97: 29-42.
- Fowler, R. L. 1999. "The Authors Named Pherecydes." *Mnemosyne* 52: 1-15.
- Fowler, R. L. 2000. *Early Greek Mythography* 1. Oxford.
- Fraenkel, E. "Zu griechischen Inschriften." *Glotta* 20: 87-93.
- Fraser, P. M. 1962. "Two Dedications from Cyrenaica." *BSA* 57: 24-27.
- Fraser, P. M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Oxford.
- Furley, W. D. 1993. "Besprechung und Behandlung: Zur Form und Funktion von EPOIDAI in der griechischen Zaubermagie." In G. W. Most, H. Petersmann, and A. M. Ritter, eds., *Philanthropia kai Eusebeia: A. Dihle zum 70. Geb.*, 80-104. Göttingen.
- Gagarin, M. 1986. *Early Greek Law*. Berkeley.
- Gager, J. G. 1992. *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*. New York.
- Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth*. Baltimore.
- Garbrah, K. A. 1988. "Notes on Inscriptions from Chios. II." *ZPE* 73: 73-74.
- Garland, R. 1987. *The Piraeus*. London.

- Gasperi, R. 1997. "Culti di eroe fondatori: Battos in oriente, Taras in occidente." *MiscGrRom* 21: 1-15.
- Gawlinski, L. 2007. "The Athenian Calendar of Sacrifices: A New Fragment from the Athenian Agora." *Hesperia* 76: 37-55.
- Gentile, L. 1999. "L'epiteto KATAΓΩΓΗΣ e l'uso del verbo KATAΓΩ in ambito religioso." *RivFil* 127: 334-43.
- Georgoudi, S. 1994. "Divinità greche e vittime animali: Demetra, Kore, Hera e il sacrificio di femmine gravide." In S. Castignone and G. Lanata, eds., *Filosofi e animali nel mondo antico*, 171-86. Genoa.
- Georgoudi, S. 2001. "'Ancêtres' de Selinonte et d'ailleurs: Le cas des Tritopatores." In G. Hoffmann, ed., *Les pierres de l'offrande: Autour de l'oeuvre de Christoph W. Clairmont*, 152-63. Kilchberg.
- Gerard-Rousseau, M. 1968. *Les mentions religieuses dans les tablettes myceniennes*. Rome.
- Giannelli, G. 1963. *Culti e miti della Magna Grecia*². Florence.
- Gibbs, S. L. 1976. *Greek and Roman Sundials*. New Haven.
- Ginouves, R. 1962. *Βαλανευτική: Recherches sur le bain dans l'antiquité grecque*. Paris.
- Giuliani, A. 1998. "La purificazione dagli ἑλῶστροι nella lege sacra di Selinunte." *Aevum* 72: 67-89.
- Goette, H. R. 2001. *Athens, Attica, and the Megarid*. London.
- Goldstein, M. S. 1978. "The Setting of the Ritual Meal in Greek Sanctuaries, 600-300 B.c." PhD diss., University of California-Berkeley.
- Graf F. 1985. *Nordionische Kulte*. Vevey.
- Graf, F. 1997. *Magic in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Graham, A. J. 1995. JJK reviewed. *Phoenix* 49: 366-67.
- Grebe, S. 1999. "Jüngere oder ältere Mädchen? Aristophanes, *Lysistrate* 641-47." *MusHelv* 56: 194-203.
- Gruppe, O. 1906. *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*. Munich.
- Guarducci, M. 1967. *Epigrafia greca* 1. Rome.
- Guarducci, M. 1970. "Nuovi cippi sacri a Velia." *ParPass* 25: 252-61.
- Haas, V. 1994. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. Leiden.
- Habicht, C. 1970. *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte*². Munich.
- Habicht, C. 1979. *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Munich.
- Habicht, C. 1985. *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*. Berkeley.
- Habicht, C. 1997. *Athens from Alexander to Antony*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Hamdorf, F. W. 1964. *Griechische Kultpersonifikationen der vorhellenistischen Zeit*. Mainz.
- Hamilton, R. 1989. "Alkman and the Athenian Arkteia." *Hesperia* 58: 450-72.
- Hampe, R. 1952. "'Idäische Grotte' in Olympia?" In G. E. Mylonas, ed., *Studies Presented to D. M. Robinson*, 1.336-50. St. Louis.
- Hampe, R. 1967. *Kult der Winde in Athen und Kreta. SitzHeidelberg* 1967: 1.
- Hanell, K. 1934. *Megarische Studien*. Lund.
- Hatzopoulos, M. B. 1994. *Cultes et rites de la Macedoine antique*. Athens.
- Hedrick, C. W. 1990. *The Decrees of the Demotionidai*. Atlanta.
- Hedrick, C. W. 2000. "For Anyone Who Wishes to See." *AncW* 31: 127-35.
- Hemberg, B. 1954. "Τριπάτωρ und τρισήρω: Griechische Ahnenkult in klassischer und mykenischer Zeit." *Eranos* 52: 172-90.
- Hemberg, B. 1955. Ἀναξ, Ἀνασσα und Ἀνακες als Gotternamen. Upsala.
- Henrichs, A. 1981. "Human Sacrifice in Greek Religion: Three Case Studies." In J. Rudhardt and O. Reverdin, eds., *Le sacrifice dans l'antiquité*, 195242. Geneva.
- Henrichs, A. 1984. "The Eumenides and Wineless Libations in the Derveni papyrus." In *Atti del xvii congresso internazionale di papirologia*, 2.255-68. Naples.

- Henrichs, A. 1987. "Three Approaches to Greek Mythography." In J. Bremmer, ed., *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, 246-77. London.
- Henrichs, A. 1991. "Namenlosigkeit und Euphemismus: Zur Ambivalenz der chthonischen Mächte im attischen Drama." In H. Hoffman, ed., *Fragmenta Dramatica: Beiträge zur Interpretation der griechischen Tragikerfragmente und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte*, 161-201. Göttingen.
- Henrichs, A. 1994. "Anonymity and Polarity: Unknown Gods and Nameless Altars at the Areopagus." *ICS* 19: 27-58.
- Henrichs, A. 2005. "Sacrifice as to the Immortals." In R. Hagg and B. Alroth, eds., *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian*, 47-60. Stockholm.
- Herrmann, H.-V. 1962. "Zur ältesten Geschichte von Olympia." *AthMitt* 77: 3-34.
- Herter, H. 1926. *De dis Atticis Priapi similibus*. Bonn.
- Herzog, R. 1928. *Heilige Gesetze von Kos. AbhBerl* 1928: 6
- Himmelman, N. 2002. "Frühe Weihgeschenke in Olympia." In H. Kyrieleis, ed., *Olympia 1875-2000: 125 Jahre deutsche Ausgrabungen: Internationales Symposium, Berlin 9.-11. November 2000*, 91-107. Mainz.
- Holland, L. A. 1961. *Janus and the Bridge*. Rome.
- Hollinshead, M. B. 1985. "Against Iphigeneia's Adyton in Three Mainland Temples." *AJA* 89: 419-40.
- Holloway, R. R. 1991. *The Archaeology of Ancient Sicily*. London.
- Holscher, T. 2002. "Rituelle Räume und politische Denkmäler." In H. Kyrieleis, ed., *Olympia 1875-2000: 125 Jahre deutsche Ausgrabungen: Internationales Symposium, Berlin 9.-11. November 2000*, 331-345. Mainz.
- Hope Simpson, R. 1981. *Mycenaean Greece*. Park Ridge, N.J.
- Hope Simpson, R., and J. F. Lazenby. 1970. *The Catalogue of the Ships in Homer's Iliad*. Oxford.
- Hornblower, J. 1981. *Hieronymus of Cardia*. Oxford.
- Hurwit, J. M. 1999. *The Athenian Acropolis*. Cambridge.
- Hutter, M. 2003. "Aspects of Luwian Religion." In H. C. Melchert, ed., *The Luwians*, 211-80. Leiden.
- Huxley, G. L. 1973. "The Date of Pherecydes of Athens." *GRBS* 14: 137-43.
- Iakovidis, S. E. 1962. *Ἡ Μνηστεικὴ Ἀκρόπολις τῶν Ἀθηνῶν*. Athens.
- Immerwahr, H. R. 2005. "Measuring the Wine." *ZPE* 151: 100-4.
- Jacoby, F. 1949. *Attis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*. Oxford.
- Jacquemin, A. 1979. "Βορέας ὁ Θεῦρος." *BCH* 103: 189-93.
- Jameson, M. H. 1956. "The Vowing of a *Pelanos*." *AJP* 77: 55-60.
- Jameson, M. H. 1965. "Notes on the Sacrificial Calendar from Erchia." *BCH* 89: 154-72.
- Jameson, M. H. 1980. "Apollo Lykeios in Athens." *Archaiognosia* 1: 213-35.
- Jameson, M. H. 1994. "Theoxenia." In R. Hagg, ed., *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*, 35-57. Stockholm.
- Janko, R. 2001. "The Derveni Papyrus (Diagoras of Melos, *Apopyrgizontes Logoi*?): A New Translation." *CP* 96: 1-32.
- Jannoray, J. 1941. "Nouvelles inscriptions de Lebadee." *BCH* 64-65: 36-59.
- Jeanmaire, H. 1939. *Couroi et courètes*. Lille.
- JJK. M. H. Jameson, D. R. Jordan, and R. D. Kotansky. 1993. *A Lex Sacra from Selinous. GRBMonogr.* 11.
- Johnston, S. I. 1991. "Crossroads." *ZPE* 88: 217-24.
- Johnston, S. I. 1999. *Restless Dead*. Berkeley.
- Jones, N. F. 1987. *Public Organization in Ancient Greece*. Philadelphia.
- Jordan, B. 1996. JJK reviewed. *AJP* 117: 326-28.
- Jordan, D. R. 1991. "A Meilichios Stone from Selinous." *ZPE* 86: 279-82.
- Jordan, D. R. 1992. "The Inscribed Lead Tablet from Phalasarna." *ZPE* 94: 191-94.

- Jordan, D. R. 1998. "Curse Tablets from Mytilene." *Phoenix* 52: 31-41.
- Jordan, D. R. 2000. "Three Texts from Lokroi Epizephyrioi." *ZPE* 130: 95-103.
- Jost, M. 1985. *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie*. Paris.
- Jost, M. 1998. "Versions locales et versions 'panhelleniques' des mythes arcadiens chez Pausanias." In V. Pirenne-Delforge, ed., *Les pantheons des cites*, 227-40. Liege.
- Judeich, W. 1931. *Topographie von Athen*². Munich.
- Kadletz, E. 1984. "The Sacrifice of Eumaios the Pig Herder." *GRBS* 25: 99-105.
- Kahil, L. 1963. "Quelques vases du sanctuaire d'Artemis a Brauron." *AntK Beiheft* 1: 5-29.
- Kahil, L. 1965. "Autour de l'Artemis attique." *AntK* 8: 20-33.
- Kahil, L. 1977. "L'Artemis de Brauron: Rites et mystere." *AntK* 20: 86-98.
- Kahil, L. 1979. "La deesse Artemis: Mythologie et iconographie." In *Greece and Italy in the Classical World: Acta of the XI International Congress of Classical Archaeology*, 73-87. London.
- Kahil, L. 1981. "Le 'craterisque' d'Artemis et le Brauronion de l'Acropole." *Hesperia* 50: 253-63.
- Kahil, L. 1983. "Mythological repertoire of Brauron." In W. G. Moon, ed., *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography*, 231-44. Madison.
- Kahil, L. 1988. "Le sanctuaire de Brauron et la religion grecque." *CRAI*: 799-813.
- Kearns, E. 1989. *The Heroes of Attica*. *BICS* suppl. 57.
- Kearns, E. 1990. "Saving the City." In O. Murray and S. Price, eds., *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, 323-44. Oxford.
- Kerenyi, C. 1976. *Dionysos*. Princeton.
- Kerkhecker, A. 1999. *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*. Oxford.
- Kett, P. 1966. *Prosopographie der historischen griechischen Manteis*. Erlangen-Nurenberg.
- Kingsley, P. 1995. *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic*. Oxford.
- Kingsley, P. 1996. JJK reviewed. *Cr²* 46: 281-82.
- Knigge, U. 1974. "Die Ausgrabungen im Kerameikos." *AA*: 181-94.
- Knigge, U. 1988. *Der Kerameikos von Athen: Führer durch Ausgrabungen und Geschichte*. Athens.
- Koenen, L. 1994. "Cyclic Destruction in Hesiod and the *Catalogue of Women*." *TAPA* 124: 1-34.
- Kontorini, V. 1987. "Influence de Lindos sur le droit sacre de Cyrene: Les *Suppliants* de Cyrene a la lumiere d'une inscription inedite de Lindos." In A. Mastino, ed., *L'Africa romana: Atti del IV convegno di studio. Sassari, 12-14 dicembre 1986*, 2.579-580. Sassari.
- Kontorini, V. 1989. *Ἀνέκδοτες ἐπιγραφές Πόδων*. Athens.
- Korres, M. 1996. "Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der attisch-10nischen Architektur." In E. L. Schwandner, ed., *Saule und Gebalk: Bauforscherkolloquium Berlin 1994*, 90-113. Berlin.
- Kostomitsopoulos, P. 1988. "Lindian Sacrifice: An Evaluation of the Evidence Based on New Inscriptions." In S. Dietz and I. Papachristopoulou, eds., *Archaeology in the Dodecanese*, 121-28. Copenhagen.
- Kotansky, R. 1995. "Greek Exorcistic Amulets." In M. Meyer and P. Mirecki, *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, 243-77. Leiden.
- Kouremenos, T., G. M. Parassoglou, and K. Tsantsanoglou. 2006. *The Derveni Papyrus*. Florence.
- Krech, P. 1888. *De Crateri ΨΗΦΙΣΜΑΤΩΝ ΣΥΒΑΓΩΓΗ*. Greifswald.
- Kretschmer, P. 1920. "Mythische Namen 6: Tritogeneia und die Tritopatoren." *Glotta* 10: 38-45.
- Kron, U. 1971. "Zum Hypogaum von Paestum." *JDAI* 86: 117-48.

- Kron, U. 1992. "Frauenfeste in Demeterheiligtümern: Das Thesmophorion von Bitalemi." AA: 611-50.
- Küster, E. 1913. *Die Schlange in der griechischen Kunst und Religion*. Giessen.
- Kyrieleis, H. 2002. "Zu den Anfängen des Heiligtums von Olympia." In H. Kyrieleis, ed., *Olympia 1875-2000: 125 Jahre deutsche Ausgrabungen: Internationales Symposium, Berlin 9.-11. November 2000*, 213-20. Mainz.
- Labarbe, J. 1977. *Thorikos: Les testimonia*. Ghent.
- Lalonde, G. V. 2005. "Pagan Cult to Christian Ritual: The Case of Agia Marina Theseiou." *GRBS* 45: 91-125.
- Lalonde, G. V. 2006a. *Horos Dios: An Athenian Shrine and Cult of Zeus*. Leiden.
- Lalonde, G. V. 2006b. "IG 1³1055B and the Boundary of Melite and Kollytos." *Hesperia* 75: 83-119.
- Lambert, S. D. 1993. *The Phratries of Attica*. Ann Arbor.
- Lambert, S. D. 1997. "The Attic Genos Salaminioi and the Island of Salamis." *ZPE* 119: 85-106.
- Lambert, S. D. 2000a. "The Sacrificial Calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis: A Revised Text." *ZPE* 130: 43-70.
- Lambert, S. D. 2000b. "Two notes on Attic *Leges Sacrae*." *ZPE* 130: 71-80.
- Lambert, S. D. 2002a. "Parerga III: The Genesia, Basile, and Epops Again." *ZPE* 139: 75-82.
- Lambert, S. D. 2002b. "The Sacrificial Calendar of Athens." *BSA* 97: 353-99.
- Lardinois, A. 1992. "Greek Myths for Athenian Rituals: Religion and Politics in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* and Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus*." *GRBS* 33: 313-27.
- Laronde, A. 1987. *Cyrene et la Libye hellénistique: Libykai historiai, de l'époque républicaine au principat d'Auguste*. Paris.
- Laronde, A. 1996. "L'exploitation de la chora cyrénéenne à l'époque classique et hellénistique." *CRAI* 1996: 503-27.
- Larson, J. 1997. "Handmaidens of Artemis?" *CJ* 92: 249-57.
- Larson, J. 2001. *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore*. Oxford.
- Latte, K. 1928. "Ein sakrales Gesetz aus Kyrene." *ARW* 26: 41-51 = *Kleine Schriften*. 1968, 112-21. Munich.
- Latte, K. 1933. "Zu dem neuen Sophronfragment." *Philologus* 33: 259-64, 467-69 = *Kleine Schriften*, Munich 1968, 492-98.
- Latte, K. 1960. *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, Munich.
- Lauffer, S. 1980. "Megaron." In Στήλη: Τόμος εις μνήμην Ν. Κοντολέοντος, 208-15. Athens.
- Laumonier, A. 1958. *Les cultes indigenes en Carie*. Paris.
- Lazzarini, M. L. 1998. "Zeus meilichios e le Eumenidi: Alcune considerazioni." In E. Catani and S. M. Marengo, eds., *La Cirenaica in età antica*, 311-17. Macerata.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. Baltimore.
- Leguilloux, M. 1999. "Sacrifices et repas publics dans le sanctuaire de Poseidon a Tenos: Les analyses archéozoologiques." *BCH* 123: 423-55.
- Lerat, L. 1952. *Les Locriens de l'ouest*. Paris.
- Lincoln, B. 2003. "The Initiatory Paradigm in Anthropology, Folklore, and History of Religions." In D. B. Dodd and C. A. Faraone, eds., *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives: New Critical Perspectives*, 241-54. London.
- Linders, T. 1972. *Studies in the Treasure Records of Artemis Brauronia Found in Athens*. Stockholm.
- Linders, T. 1994. "Sacred Menus on Delos." In R. Hagg, ed., *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Archaeological Evidence*, 71 -79. Stockholm.
- Lippold, G. 1911. "Τριτοπατρεῖς." *AthMitt* 36: 105-16.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1990. "Erinyes, Semnai Theai, Eumenides." In E. M. Craik, ed., "Owls to Athens": *Essays Presented to Sir K. Dover*, 203-11. Oxford.

- Lobeck, C. A. 1829. *Aglaophamus sive de theologiae mysticae Graecorum causis*. Konigsberg.
- Lohmann, H., and H. Schaefer. 2000. "Wo lag das Herakleion der Salaminioi ΕΠΙ ΠΙΟΡΘΜΩΙ?" *ZPE* 133: 91-102.
- Londey, P. 1990. "Greek Colonists and Delphi." In J.-P. Descoeudres, ed., *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*, 117-27. Oxford.
- Lupu, E. 2005. *Greek Sacred Law: A Collection of New Documents*. Leiden.
- Luzzatto, G. I. 1936. *La "lex cathartica" di Cirene*. Milan.
- Maas, P. 1944. "Επενίκτος." *Hesperia* 13: 36-37.
- Maffi, A. 2001. "Sulla lege sacra di Selinunte." In E. Cantarella and G. Thür, eds., *Symposion 1997: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, 109-14. Cologne.
- Malkin, I. 1987. *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*. Leiden.
- Mallwitz, A. 1972. *Olympia und seine Bauten*. Darmstadt.
- Mallwitz, A. 1988. "Cult and Competition Locations at Olympia." In W. J. Raschke, ed., *The Archaeology of the Olympics*, 79-109. Madison.
- Manganaro, G. 1966. "Iscrizione opistographa di Axos con prescrizioni sacrali e con un trattato di *symmachia*." *Historia* 16: 11-22.
- Manganaro, G. 1997. JJK reviewed. *Gnomon* 69: 562-64.
- Manni, E. 1981. *Geografia fisica e politica della Sicilia antica*, Kokalos, suppl. 4. Rome.
- Mari, M. 1999. "Le 'primizie di uomini' ad Apollo delfico: Indagini su un rito Greco." *MedAnt* 2: 263-320.
- Martin, R. 1951. *Recherches sur l'agora grecque*. Paris.
- Masson, O. 1970. "Philologie grecque." *AnNEHE*: 229-35.
- Masson, O. 1989. "Myskellos, fondateur de Crotone, et le nom *Myskel(I)os." *RevPhil* 63: 61-65.
- Matthaiou, A. 1988. "Μῦς Ὠσπον." *Horos* 6: 77-78.
- Matthaiou, A. 1998. "Τρεῖς ἐπιγραφές Πάρων." *Horos* 10-12: 424-30.
- Matthaiou, A. 1999. "Ελάχιστερος-Αλλάστρεος." *Horos* 13: 241-42.
- Matthiessen, L. 1873. "Das Klima von Athen." In A. Mommsen, ed., *Griechische Jahreszeiten*, 2.99-153. Schleswig.
- Mazarakis Ainian, A. 1997. *From Rulers' Dwellings to Temples: Architecture, Religion, and Society in Early Iron Age Greece*. Jonsered.
- McCartney, E. S. 1930. "Greek and Roman Weather Lore of Winds." *CW* 24: 11-16.
- Merkelbach, R., and M. West. 1967. "The Wedding of Ceyx." *RhM*, n.s., 108: 300-17.
- Mertens, D. 1999. "Verso l'agora di Selinunte." In *La colonisation grecque en Mediterranee occidentale: Actes de la rencontre scientifique en hommage a G. Vallet, 15-18 novembre 1995*, 185-93. Rome.
- Mikalson, J. D. 1975. *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year*. Princeton.
- Mikalson, J. D. 1998. *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*. Berkeley.
- Miles, M. M. 1998a. *The City Eleusinion*. Princeton.
- Miles, M. M. 1998b. "The Propylon to the Sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros at Selinus." *AJA* 102: 35-57.
- Miller, S. G. 1974. "The Date of Olympic Festivals." *AthMitt* 90: 215-31.
- Miller, S. G. 1995. "Old Metroon and Old Buleuterion in the Classical Agora of Athens." In M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub, eds., *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, 133-56. Wiesbaden.
- Moggi, M. 1976. *Isinecismi interstatali greci* 1. Pisa.
- Mommsen, A. 1898. *Feste der Stadt Athen*. Leipzig.
- Mondi, R. 1983. "The Homeric Cyclopes." *TAPA* 113: 17-38.
- Montepaone, C. 1979. "Il mito di fondazione del rituale munichio in onore di Artemis." In *Recherches sur les cultes grecs et l'occident 1: Cahiers du centre Jean Berard* 5, 65-76. Naples.

- Moraux, P. 1959. *Une imprecation funéraire a Neocesaree*. Paris.
- Morelli, D. 1959. *I culti in Rodi*. Pisa.
- Moret, J.-P. 1993. "Les departs des enfers dans l'imagerie apulienne." *RA* 1993: 293-351.
- Moretti, L. 1957. *Olympionikai: I vincitori negli antichi agoni Olimpici*. Rome. Morgan, C. 1990. *Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century b.c.* Cambridge.
- Morris, S. P. 1992. *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art*. Princeton.
- Moscato Castelnovo, L. 1996. JJK reviewed. *RBPhil* 74: 215-18.
- Moustaka, A. 2002a. "On the Cult of Hera at Olympia." In R. Hagg, ed., *Peloponnesian Sanctuaries and Cults*, 199-205. Stockholm.
- Moustaka, A. 2002b. "Zeus und Hera im Heiligtum von Olympia und die Kulttopographie von Elis und Triphylien." In H. Kyrieleis, ed., *Olympia 1875-2000: 125 Jahre deutsche Ausgrabungen: Internationales Symposium, Berlin 9.-11. November* 301-315. Mainz.
- Mylonopoulos, J. 2003. Πελοπόννησος οἰκητήριον Ποσειδῶνος: *Heiligtümer und Kulte des Poseidon auf der Peloponnes*. Liege.
- Naumann, F. 1983. *Die Ikonographie der Kybele in der phrygischen und der griechischen Kunst*. Tübingen.
- Nemeth, G. 1994. "Μεδ' ὄνθον ἐβάλεν." In R. Hagg, ed., *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*, 59-64. Stockholm.
- Nenci, G. 1994. "La κύρβις selinuntina." *AnnPisa* 24: 459-66.
- Nesselrath, H.-G. 2000. "Eupolis and the Periodization of Athenian Comedy." In D. Harvey and J. Wilkins, eds., *The Rivals of Aristophanes*, 233-46. Swansea.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1906. *Griechische Feste*. Leipzig.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1908a. "Schlangenstele des Zeus Ktesios." *AthMitt* 33: 279-88 = *Opuscula Selecta* 1, Lund 1951, 25-34.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1908b. "Zu Zeus Kataibates." *RhM* 63: 314-15 = *Opuscula Selecta* i, Lund 1951, 34-36.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1923. "Fire Festivals in Ancient Greece." *JHS* 43: 144-48.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1932a. "Die Gotter des Symposion." In *Symbolaepilologicae O. A. Danielsson octogenario dicatae*, 218-31, Upsala = *Opuscula Selecta* 1, Lund 1951, 428-42.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1932b. *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology*. Berkeley.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1935. "Die eleusinischen Gottheiten." *ArchRW* 32: 79-141 = *Opuscula Selecta* 2, Lund 1952, 542-623.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1938. "Vater Zeus." *ArchRW* 35: 136-71 = *Opuscula Selecta* 2, 710-31.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1940. *Greek Popular Religion*. New York.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1944. "Die eleusinischen Kulte der attischen Demen und das neue Sakralgesetz aus Paiania." *Eranos* 42: 70-76 = *Opuscula Selecta* 3, 92-98. Lund.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1951. *Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics*. Lund.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1955. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* i². Munich (= i³ 1967).
- Nilsson, M. P. 1961. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 2. Munich (= 2 1967).
- Nilsson, M. P. 1962. *Die Entstehung und religiöse Bedeutung des griechischen Kalenders*². Lund.
- Nock, A. D. 1925. "Eunuchs in Ancient Religion." *ArchRW* 23: 25-33 = *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, 1972, 1.7-15. Oxford.
- Nock, A. D. 1926. "A Curse from Cyrene." *ArchRW* 24: 172-73.
- Nock, A. D. 1944. "The Cult of Heroes." *HSCP* 37: 141-74 = *Essays* 2.575-602.
- North, J. A. 1996. "Pollution and Purification at Selinous." *SCI* 15: 293-301.
- Obbink, D. 1994. "A Quotation of the Derveni Papyrus in Philodemus' *On Piety*." *ChronErc* 24: 111-35.
- Obbink, D. 1997. "Cosmology as Initiation vs. the Critique of Orphic Mysteries." In

- A. Laks and G. W. Most, eds., *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*, 39-54. Oxford.
- Odelberg, P. 1896. *Sacra Corinthia, Sicyonia, Phliasia*. Upsala.
- Ogden, D. 1996. *Greek Bastardy*. Oxford.
- Ogden, D. 1997. *The Crooked Kings of Ancient Greece*. London.
- Ohly, D. 1965. "Kerameikos-Grabung: Tätigkeitsbericht 1956-1961." *ArchAnz*: 277-376.
- Oliverio, G. 1928. "Campagna di scavi a Cirene nell'estate del 1926: I principali documenti epigrafici." *Africa Italiana* 1: 317-36.
- Oliverio, G. 1933. *La stele dei nuovi comandamenti e dei cereali: Documenti antichi dell'Africa Italiana* 2. Bergamo.
- Oliverio, G. 1961. "Iscrizioni cirenaiche." *QuadArchLibia* 4: 1-54.
- Osanna, M. 1993. "Pausania a Patraso: Culti e organizzazione dello spazio sull'acropoli di una città greca." *Ostraka* 2: 99-103.
- Osanna, M. 1996. "Artemis in Patras: Wandel einer Polis im Spiegel ihrer Kulte." In P. Bertkold, J. Schmid, and C. Wacker, eds., *Akarnanien: Eine Landschaft im antiken Griechenland*, 183-93. Würzburg.
- Osborne, R. 1985. *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attica*. Cambridge.
- Palaiokrassa, L. 1989. "Neue Befunde aus dem Heiligtum der Artemis Munichia." *AthMitt* 104: 1-40.
- Palaiokrassa, L. 1991. *Τὸ ἱερὸ τῆς Ἀρτεμίδος Μοννυχίας*. Athens.
- Papachristodoulou, C. 1968. *Ἀνάγλνφα Εὐμενίδων ἐξ Ἀργολίδος*. *ArchDelt* 23: 117-31, pls. 50-57.
- Papadopoulos, J. K. 1996. "The Original Kerameikos of Athens and the Siting of the Classical Agora." *GRBS* 37: 107-28.
- Papadopoulos, J. K. 2003. *Ceramicus Redivivus: The Early Iron Age Potters' Field in the Area of the Classical Athenian Agora*, *Hesperia*, suppl. 31. Princeton.
- Parisi Presicce, C. 1984. "La funzione delle aree sacre nell'organizzazione urbanistica primitiva delle colonie greche." *ArchClass* 36: 19-132.
- Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. 1987. "Festivals of the Attic Demes." *Boreas* 15: 137-47.
- Parker, R. 1995a. "Early Orphism." In A. Powell, ed., *The Greek World*, 483-510. London.
- Parker, R. 1995b. Review of *The Iconography of Greek Cult in the Archaic and Classical Periods*, ed. R. Hagg (Liege 1992). *CR* 45: 299-300.
- Parker, R. 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. 2004. "What Are Sacred Laws?" In E. M. Harris and L. Rubinstein, eds., *The Law and the Courts in Ancient Greece*, 57-70. London.
- Parker, R. 2005a. "ὥς ἤρωι ἐναγίζειν." In R. Hagg and B. Alroth, eds., *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian*, 37-45. Stockholm.
- Parker, R. 2005b. "Artemis Ilithye et autres: Le probleme du nom divin utilise comme epiclese." In *Nommer les dieux: Theonymes, epithetes, epicleses dans l'Antiquite (Recherches sur les rhetoriques religieuses 5)*, 219-26. Rennes.
- Parker, R. 2005c. *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. 2006. "Sale of a Priesthood on Chios." In *Χιακὸν Συμπόσιον εἰς μνήμην W. G. Forrest*, 67-79. Athens.
- Pearson, L. 1987. *The Greek Historians of the West: Timaeus and His Predecessors*. Atlanta.
- Perlman, P. 1983. "Plato Laws 833C-844D and the Bears of Brauron." *GRBS* 24: 115-30.
- Perlman, P. 1989. "Acting the She-bear for Artemis." *Arethusa* 22: 111-33.
- Pernier, L. 1931. "L'Artemision di Cirene." *Africa Italiana* 4: 173-228.
- Pernier, L. 1936. "Il tempio e l'altare di Artemide a Cirene." *A&R* 39: 171-75.
- Perusino F. 2002. "Le orse di Braura nella *Lisistrata* di Aristofane." In P. Gentili and

- F. Perusino, eds., *Le orse di Brauron: Un rituale di iniziazione femminile nel santuario di Artemide*, 167-74. Pisa.
- Pestalozza, U. 1933. "Sacerdoti e sacerdotesse impuberi nei culti di Athena e di Artemide." *StudMatStorRel* 9: 173-202.
- Petropoulou, A. 1987. "The Sacrifice of Eumaeus Reconsidered." *GRBS* 28: 135-49.
- Petrovic, I. 2007. *Von den Toren des Hades zu den Hallen des Olymp: Artemiskult bei Theokrit und Kallimachos*. Leiden.
- Pfeiffer, R. 1922. *Kallimachosstudien*. Munich.
- Pfuhl, E. 1900. *De Atheniensium sacrispompis*. Berlin.
- Piccaluga, G. 1966. *Τὰ Φερρεφάττη ανθολόγια*. "Maia" 18: 232-53.
- Piraino, M. T. 1959. "Iscrizione inedita da Poggioreale." *Kokalos* 5: 159-73.
- Pompeo, L. 1999. *Il complesso architettonico del tempio M di Selinunte*. Florence.
- Porciani, L. 2001. "Il problema della datazione." In C. Ampolo, ed., *Da un'antica città di Sicilia: Idecreti di Entella e Nakone: Catalogo della mostra*, 43-47. Pisa.
- Pouilloux, J. 1954. *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*. Paris.
- Prosdocimi, A. L. 1999. "Sicilia: Note sull'alfabetizzazione." In M. I. Gulletta, ed., *Sicilia epigrafica: Atti del convegno di studi, Erice, 15-18 ottobre 1998*, 465-82. Pisa.
- Prückner, H. 1968. *Die lokrischen Tonreliefs*. Mainz.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. 1987. "Kyrenaika 3: Akamantiades." *QuadArchLibia* 12: 28-32.
- Pulley, S. 1997. *Prayer in Greek Religion*. Oxford.
- Puttkammer, F. 1910. *Quo modo Graeci victimarum carnes distribuerint*. Königsberg.
- Raaflaub, K. A. 1998. "The Thetes and Democracy." In I. Morris and Raaflaub, eds., *Democracy 2500? Questions and Challenges*, 87-103. Dubuque.
- Rambach, J. 2002a. "Dorpfelds Bau VII in der Altis von Olympia: Ein frühheizenzeitliches Apsidenhaus und 'Haus des Oinomaos'" *AA*: 119-34.
- Rambach, J. 2002b. "Olympia: 2,500 Jahre Vorgeschichte vor der Gründung des eisenzeitlichen griechischen Heiligtums." In H. Kyrieleis, ed., *Olympia 1875-2000: 125 Jahre deutsche Ausgrabungen: Internationales Symposium, Berlin 9.-11. November*, 177-212. Mainz.
- Rausch, M. 2000a. "Damos: Gruppi e individui in una *lex sacra* di Selinunte." *Minima epigraphica et papyrologica* 3: 39-52.
- Rausch, M. 2000b. "Das Hypogaion auf der Agora von Poseidonia: Ein Kultort der Tritopatores?" *Kernos* 13: 107-16.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1981. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford.
- Richter, G. M. A. 1959. *A Handbook of Greek Art*. London.
- Riedweg, C. 2002. "Poesie orphique et rituel initiatique." *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 219: 459-81.
- Rigsby, K. 2000. "A Suppliant at Gerasa." *Phoenix* 54: 99-106.
- Robert, C. 1893. "Sosipolis in Olympia." *AthMitt* 18: 37-45.
- Robert, C. 1921. *Die griechische Heldensage*, 2.3, 3.1. Berlin.
- Robert, L. 1934. "Decret de Tralles." *RPhil*: 279-91 = *Op. Min. Sel.* 2: 1178-90.
- Robertson, N. 1978a. "The Goddess on the Ingot in Greco-Roman Times." *RDAC* 1978: 202-5.
- Robertson, N. 1978b. "The Myth of the First Sacred War." *CQ* 28: 38-73.
- Robertson, N. 1982. "The Ritual Background of the Dying God in Cyprus and Syro-Palestine." *HTHR* 75: 313-59.
- Robertson, N. 1983. "Greek Ritual Begging in Aid of Women's Fertility and Childbirth." *TAPA* 113: 143-69.
- Robertson, N. 1984a. "Poseidon's Festival at the Winter Solstice." *CQ* 34: 1-16.
- Robertson, N. 1984b. "The Ritual Background of the Erysichthon Story." *AJP* 105: 369-408.
- Robertson, N. 1985. "The Origin of the Panathenaea." *RhM* 128: 231-95.

- Robertson, N. 1986. "Solon's Axones and Kyrbeis and the Sixth-century Background." *Historia* 35: 147-76.
- Robertson, N. 1988. "Melanthus, Codrus, Neleus, Caucon: Ritual Myth as Athenian History." *GRBS* 29: 201-61.
- Robertson, N. 1990a. "The Laws of Athens, 410-399 B.c.: The Evidence for Review and Publication." *JHS* 110: 43-75.
- Robertson, N. 1990b. "Some Recent Work on Greek Religion." *EchCl²* 9: 419-42.
- Robertson, N. 1991a. "Myth, Ritual, and Livelihood in Early Greece". In M. Silver, ed., *Ancient Economy in Mythology: East and West*, 3-34. Savage, Md.
- Robertson, N. 1991b. "Some Recent Work on Greek Mythology." *EchCl²* 10: 57-79.
- Robertson, N. 1992. *Festivals and Legends: The Formation of Greek Cities in the Light of Public Ritual*. Toronto.
- Robertson, N. 1993. "Athens' Festival of the New Wine." *HSCP* 95: 197-250.
- Robertson, N. 1996a. "The Ancient Mother of the Gods: A Missing Chapter in the History of Greek Religion." In E. Lane, ed., *Cybele, Attis, and Related Cults: Essays in Memory of M. J. Vermaseren*, 239-304. Leiden.
- Robertson, N. 1996b. "Athena and Early Greek Society: Palladium Shrines and Promontory Shrines." In M. Dillon, ed., *Religion in the Ancient World: New Themes and Approaches*, 383-475. Amsterdam.
- Robertson, N. 1996c. "Athena's Shrines and Festivals." In J. Neils, ed., *Worshipping Athena*, 27-77. Madison.
- Robertson, N. 1996d. "New Light on Demeter's Mysteries: The Festival Proerosia." *GRBS* 37: 319-79.
- Robertson, N. 1998a. "The City Center of Archaic Athens." *Hesperia* 67: 285-302.
- Robertson, N. 1998b. "Phratries and Trittyes: the Early Organization of Attica". In T. W. Hillard, R. A. Kearsley, C. E. V. Nixon, and A. M. Nobbs, eds., *Ancient History in a Modern University* 1, 111-20. Grand Rapids.
- Robertson, N. 1998c. "The Two Processions to Eleusis and the Program of the Mysteries." *AJP* 119: 547-75.
- Robertson, N. 1999a. "Callimachus' Tale of Sicyon (SH 238)." *Phoenix* 53: 57-79.
- Robertson, N. 1999b. "The Sequence of Days at the Thesmophoria and at the Eleusinian Mysteries." *EchCl²* 18: 1-33.
- Robertson, N. 2001. "Athena as Weather Goddess: The Aegis in Myth and Ritual." In A. Villing and S. Deacy, eds., *Athena in the Classical World*, 29-55. Leiden.
- Robertson, N. 2002. "The Religious Criterion in Greek Ethnicity: The Dorians and the Festival Carneia." *AJAH²* 1: 5-74.
- Robertson, N. 2003a. "Aesop's Encounter with Isis and the Muses." In E. Csapo and M. Miller, eds., *Poetry, Theory, Praxis: Essays in Honour of W. J. Slater*, 247-66. Oxford.
- Robertson, N. 2003b. "Orphic Mysteries and Dionysiac Ritual." In M.B. Cosmopoulos, ed., *Greek Mysteries. The Archaeology and Ritual of Greek Secret Cults*, 218-40. London.
- Robertson, N. 2004. "The Praxiergidae Decree (IG i² 7) and the Dressing of Athena's Statue with the Peplos." *GRBS* 44: 111-61.
- Robertson, N. 2005. "Athenian Shrines of Aphrodite and the Early Development of the City." In E. Greco, ed., *Teseo e Romolo: Le origini di Atene e Roma a confronto: Atti del convegno 30 giugno-1 luglio 2003*, 43-112. Rome.
- Robinson, E. W. 2002. "Lead Plates and the Case for Democracy in Fifth-century B.c. Camarina." In V. B. Gorman and E. W. Robinson, eds., *Oikistes: Studies in Constitution, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World: Offered in Honor of A. J. Graham*, 61 -77. Leiden.
- Rohde, E. 1896. "Paralipomena." *RhM* 50: i-30 = *Kleine Schriften* 2, Tübingen 1901, 224-45.

- Rohde, E. 1925. *Psyche* (Eng. tr. of W. B. Hillis = Rohde's revision of 1897). London.
- Rolley, C. 1965. "Le sanctuaire des dieux Patrooi et le Thesmophorion de Thasos." *BCH* 89: 44-83.
- Rosivach, V. J. 1978. "The Altar of Zeus Agoraios in the 'Heracleidae.'" *PP* 33: 32-47.
- Rosivach, V. J. 1994. *The System of Public Sacrifice in Fourth-century Athens*. Atlanta.
- Roussel, P. 1929. "Deux familles atheniennes a Delos i: Les Pyrrhakidai." *BCH* 54: 166-84.
- Rudhardt, J. 1958. *Notions fondamentales de la pensee religieuse et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grece classique*. Geneva (= ed. 2, Paris, 1992).
- Sacks, K. S. 1976. "Herodotus and the Dating of the Battle of Thermopylae." *CQ*² 26: 232-48.
- Salapata, G. 1995. "ΔΠΑΚΟΝΤΩΔΕΙΣ ΚΟΠΑΙ: Erinyes / Eumenides in Lakonia." *AJA* 99: 315.
- Salapata, G. 2002. "Myth into Cult: Alexandra / Cassandra in Lakonia." In V. B. Gorman and E. W. Robinson, eds., *Oikistes: Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World: Offered in Honor of A. J. Graham*, 131-59. Leiden.
- Sale, W. 1975. "The Temple-legend of the Arkteia." *RhM* 118: 265-84.
- Salviat, F. 1958. "Une nouvelle loi thasienne: Institutions judiciaires et fetes religieuses a la fin du iv^e siècle av. J.-C." *BCH* 82: 3-267.
- Salviat, F. 1964. "Les theogamies attiques, Zeus teleios, et l' Agamemnon d'Eschyle." *BCH* 88: 647-54.
- Samuel, A. E. 1972. *Greek and Roman Chronology*. Munich.
- Santucci, A. 1998. "Il santuario dell'Anax nell'agora di Cirene." In E. Catani and S. M. Marengo, eds., *La Cirenaica in eta antica*, 523-35. Macerata.
- Sarian, H. 1986. "Reflexions sur l'iconographie des Erinyes dans le milieu grec, italote et etrusque." In L. Kahil, C. Auge, and P. Linant de Bellefonds, eds., *Iconographie classique et identites regionales*, 25-35. *BCH* suppl. 14. Paris.
- Scanlon, T. F. 1988. "Virgineum gymnasium: Spartan Females and Early Greek Athletics." In W. J. Raschke, ed., *The Archaeology of the Olympics*, 185-216. Madison.
- Schachter, A. 1981. *Cults of Boiotia* 1. *BICS* suppl. 38.1. London.
- Schachter, A. 1986. *Cults of Boiotia* 2. *BICS* suppl. 38.2. London.
- Schachter, A. 1990. *Le sanctuaire grec*. Geneva.
- Schachter, A. 1994. *Cults of Boiotia* 3. *BICS* suppl. 38.3. London.
- Schaefer, H. 1939. *Die Laubhütte: Ein Beitrag zur Kultur- und Religionsgeschichte Griechenlands und Italiens*. Leipzig.
- Schlesinger, E. 1933. *Die griechische Asylie*. Giessen.
- Schmalz, G. C. R. 2006. "The Athenian Prytaneion Discovered?" *Hesperia* 75: 33-81.
- Schmidt, W. 1908. *Geburtstag im Altertum*. Giessen.
- Schultz, W. 1904. *Farbenempfindungssystem der Hellenen*. Leipzig.
- Schuster, P. R. 1869. *De veteris Orphicae theogoniae indolis atque origine*. Leipzig.
- Schwabl, H. 1996. "Zur lex sacra von Selinus" (JKK reviewed). *WS* 109: 284-86.
- Scullion, S. 1994. "Olympian and Chthonian." *CA* 13: 75-119.
- Scullion, S. 1998. "Three Notes on Attic Sacrificial Calendars." *ZPE* 121: 116-22.
- Scullion, S. 2000. "Heroic and Chthonian Sacrifice: New Evidence from Selinus." *ZPE* 132: 163-71.
- Scullion, S. 2001. "Tradition and Invention in Euripidean Aitiology." In M. Cropp, K. Lee, and D. Sansone, eds., *Euripides and Tragic Theatre in the Late Fifth Century*, *ICS* 24-25, 217-33. Champaign.
- Segre, M., and G. Pugliese Carratelli. 1953. *Tituli camirenses* = *ASAtene* 27-29 [n.s. 11-13].

- Seidl, U. 2007. "A Goddess from Karkamis at Olympia?" In A. Cilingiroglu and A. Sagona (eds.), *Anatolian Iron Ages 6. Colloquium Held at Eskisehir, 16-20 August 2004*, 225-43. Leuven.
- Servais, J. 1960. "Les suppliants dans la 'loi sacree' de Cyrene." *BCH* 84: 112-47.
- Serwint, N. 1993. "The Female Athletic Costume at the Heraia and Prenuptial Initiation Rites." *AJA* 97: 403-22.
- Sfameni Gasparro, G. 1973. *I culti orientali in Sicilia*. Leiden.
- Sfameni Gasparro, G. 1986. *Misteri e culti mistici di Demetra*. Rome.
- Shear, T. L., Jr. 1995. "Bouleuterion, Metroon, and the Archives at Athens." In M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub, eds., *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, 157-90. Wiesbaden.
- Sherwin-White, S. M. 1978. *Ancient Cos*. Göttingen.
- Sicilia. *Guida d'Italia* 22. 1968. Milan.
- Sickinger, J. P. 1999. *Public Records and Archives in Classical Athens*. Chapel Hill.
- Siewert, P. 2002. "Wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Bedeutung der Bronzeurkunden." In H. Kyrieleis, ed., *Olympia 1875-2000: 125 Jahre deutsche Ausgrabungen: Internationales Symposium, Berlin 9.-11. November 2000*, 359-70. Mainz.
- Simms, R. 2003. "Agra and Agrai." *GRBS* 43: 219-29.
- Simon, E. 1980. "Die Mittelgruppe im Westgiebel des Parthenon." In H. A. Kahn and E. Simon, eds., *Tainia: Roland Hampe zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht*, 239-55. Mainz.
- Simon, E. 1983. *Festivals of Attica*. Madison.
- Sinn, U. 1981. "Das Heiligtum der Artemis Limnatis bei Kombothekra." *AthMitt* 96: 25-71.
- Sjovall, H. 1931. *Zeus im altgriechischen Hauskult*. Lund.
- Sokolowski, F. 1954. "The Real Meaning of Sacral Manumission." *HTHR* 47: 173-81.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1988. *Studies in Girls' Transitions*. Athens.
- Sparkes, B. A. 1962. "The Greek Kitchen." *JHS* 82: 121-37.
- Sporn, K. 2002. *Heiligtümer und Kulte Kretas in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit*. Heidelberg.
- Srebrny, S. 1931. "De psaltria Eupolidis Baptarum persona." *Eos* 33: 503-17.
- Srebrny, S. 1936. "Kult der thrakischen Göttin Kotyto in Korinth und Sicilien." In *Melanges F. Cumont*, 1.432-47. Brussels.
- Stengel, P. 1910. *Opferbrauche der Griechen*. Leipzig.
- Stengel, P. 1920. *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*. Munich.
- Storey I. C. 2003. *Eupolis: Poet of Old Comedy*. Oxford.
- Strid, O. 1999. *Die Dryoper: Eine Untersuchung der Überlieferung*. Upsala.
- Stroud, R. S. 1998. *The Athenian Grain-tax Law of 374/3 b.c., Hesperia* suppl. 29. Princeton.
- Stucchi, S. 1965. *L'agora di Cirene I: I lati Nord ed Est della platea inferiore*. Rome.
- Stucchi, S. 1975. *Architettura cirenaica*. Rome.
- Stucchi, S. 1981. "Di un mitreo e di un oracolo a Cirene." In S. Stucchi, *Divagazioni archeologiche I*, 101-16. Rome.
- Stukey, H. J. 1937. "The Cyrenaean Hikesioi." *CJ* 32: 32-43.
- Taillardat, J. 1987. "Sens et etymologie de τριτογενεία." *REG* 100: xii.
- Taillardat, J. 1995. "Tritogeneia, tritogenes: L'enfant premier-ne." *RPh* 69: 283-88.
- Taplin, O. 1977. *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford.
- Themelis, P. G. 2002. "Contribution to the Topography of the Sanctuary at Brauron." In P. Gentili and F. Perusino, eds., *Le orse di Brauron: Un rituale di iniziazione femminile nel santuario di Artemide*, 103-16. Pisa.
- Theodorescu, D., and E. Greco. 1983. *Poseidonia-Paestum II: L'agora, Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome* 42. Rome.

- Thompson, D. W. 1918. "The Greek Winds." *CR* 32: 49-56.
- Thompson, H. A., and R. E. Wycherley. 1972. *The Agora of Athens*. Princeton.
- Thompson, W. E. 1971. "Attic Kinship Terminology." *JHS* 91: 110-13.
- Thomsen, A. 1909. "Der Trug des Prometheus." *ArchRW* 12: 640-90.
- Toepffer, J. 1889. *Attische Genealogie*. Berlin.
- Traill, J. S. 1986. *Demos and Trittys*. Toronto.
- Travlos, J. 1971. *Pictorial Dictionary of Athens*. London.
- Travlos, J. 1988. *Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Attika*. Tübingen.
- Tresp, A. 1914. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Kultschriftsteller*. Giessen.
- Trümper, C. 1997. *Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Monatsnamen und Monatsfolgen*. Heidelberg.
- Trümper, C. 1998. "Feste zur Vollmondszeit: Die religiösen Feiern Attikas im Monatslauf und der vorgeschichtliche attische Kultkalender." *ZPE* 121: 109-15.
- Tusa, V. 1971. "Selinunte punica." *RivStArch* 18: 47-67.
- Tusa, V. 1977. "Nuovi rinvenimenti nell'area del santuario della Malophoros a Selinunte." *CronCatania* 16: 115-18.
- Usener, H. 1895. *Gotternamen*. Bonn.
- Usener, H. 1905. "Keraunos." *RhM* 60: i-30 = *Kl. Schr.* 4, Leipzig 1913, 471-97.
- van Effenterre, H. 85. "Préliminaires épigraphiques aux études d'histoire du droit grec." In *Symposium 1982: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte, Santander, 1-4 September 1982*, i-8. Cologne.
- van Straten, F. T. 1995. *Hiera Kala: Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Leiden.
- Verdenius, W. J. 1955. "Notes on Plato's 'Phaedrus.'" *Mnemosyne* 8: 265-89.
- Vessey, D. 1973. *Statius and the Thebaid*. Cambridge.
- Vian, F. 1952. *La guerre des géants*. Paris.
- Vickers, M., and L. H. Jeffery. 1974. "Two More Rattling Cups?" *AJA* 78: 429-31.
- Vogliano, A. 1928. "Nuovi studi sulle decretali di Cirene." *RivFil*, n.s., 6: 255-320.
- Waanders, F. M. J. 1983. *The History of τῶλος and τεῶλω in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam.
- Wachter, T. 1910. *Reinheitsvorschriften im griechischen Kult*. Giessen.
- Wallace, R. W. 1985. *The Areopagos Council to 307 B.C.* Baltimore.
- Weaver, B. H. 1996. "A Further Allusion in the *Eumenides* to the Panathenaia." *CQ* 46: 559-61.
- Weniger, L. 1904. "Das Hochfest des Zeus in Olympia i. Die Ordnung der Agone." *Klio* 4: 125-51.
- Weniger, L. 1905a. "Das Hochfest des Zeus in Olympia 2. Olympische Zeitenordnung." *Klio* 5: i-38.
- Weniger, L. 1905b. "Das Hochfest des Zeus in Olympia 3. Der Gottesfriede." *Klio* 5: 184-218.
- Weniger, L. 1907. "Olympische Forschungen 3. Dienst der Muttergöttin und Verwandtes." *Klio* 7: 145-82.
- West, M. L. 1983. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford.
- West, M. L. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon*. Oxford.
- West, M. L. 2002. "'Eumelos': A Corinthian Epic Cycle?" *JHS* 122: 109-33.
- West, M. L. 2007. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford.
- White, D. 1964. "Demeter's Sicilian Cult as a Political Instrument." *GRBS* 5: 261-79.
- White, D. 1967. "The Post-classical Cult of Malophoros at Selinus." *AJA* 71: 335-51.
- Wide, S. 1893. *Lakonische Kulte*. Leipzig.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v. 1893. *Aristoteles und Athen*. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v. 1919. *Platon*. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v. 1922. *Pindaros*. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v. 1927. "Heilige Gesetze." *SBBerlin*: 155-76.

- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. 1930. "Lesefrüchte 280." *Hermes* 65. 256-58 = *Kleine Schriften* 4, Berlin, 525-27.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. 1931. *Der Glaube der Hellenen* 1. Berlin.
- Wissowa, G. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*². Munich.
- Wycheley, R. E. 1957. *The Athenian Agora: Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia*. Princeton.
- Wycheley, R. E. 1963. "Pausanias at Athens, II." *GRBS* 4: 157-75.
- Wycheley, R. E. 1978. *The Stones of Athens*. Princeton.
- Zuntz, G. 1971 . *Persephone*. Oxford.

Subject Index

abaton

- on Cadmeia, [235n29](#)
- Nymphs, [207–9](#)
- structures on Delos, [159n15](#)
- Zeus *kataibates*, [247](#)

Acraiae, [71](#), [73](#)

acropolis

- Artemis and Dionysus at Patrae, [326–27](#)
- Athena at Lindus, [311](#)
- Athena at Sparta, [150](#)
- cults at Cyrene, [281–82](#)
- lead tablet displayed there?, [36–38](#), [50](#), [224](#)
- metope at Selinus, [90](#)

Acropolis of Athens

- Aphrodite and *Erôs*, [197](#)
- Artemis, [347](#)
- Athena, [114](#), [170](#), [207](#)
- calendar offerings, [170–71](#)
- Cylon's coup, [111](#), [143](#), [144–49](#)
- Cylon's statue, [143](#), [145–46](#)
- early settlement below, [138](#), [205–6](#)
- Erechtheus, [208](#)
- Pelargikon* wall, [115](#)
- Poseidon, [170](#), [207](#)
- Skirophoria* procession, [209](#)
- theater seats, [113](#)
- Zeus *kataibates*, [247–48](#)

Adônia, Adonis, [90n17](#)

adyton

- temples of Artemis, [322](#), [340](#), [342](#), [344](#)
- temple of Demeter *malophoros*, [202](#)

Aegina, [60n31](#), [120n57](#)

Aeneas

- rebukes Achilles, [44](#)
- name on *milichios* stone, [191n20](#)

aetiology (cults and festivals explained by stories)

- Aphrodite and Eros at Athens, [197](#)

Apollo

- Hyakinthia* at Amyclae, [312](#)
- Karneia*, [134n22](#)
- pythaeus* at Asine, [312–15](#)

Apollo and Artemis

Boëdromia at Athens, 139–40

Artemis

in Arcadia, 339

at Brauron, 332, 339–40, 345

at Munichia, 341–44

on Naxos 324–25, 328

at Patrae, 325–27

Athena

Nikêtêria at Athens, 246

Palladion temple at Athens, 332

Demeter

at Athens (see *Skirophoria*)

at Cyrene, 293

Daira, *Daeira*, 105, 120–22

Dêô, 122–25

at Eleusis, 81, 89n10, 118–20

Dionysus

at Athens, 110–11, 328

on Naxos, 328–29

at Olenus, 326n22

Orphic story, 234

at Patrae, 326–7

Eumenides

at Gela, 89n10, 92, 98

near Megalopolis, 97–98, 100–101, 134n23

Orphic stories, 101–5

near Sicyon, 96

snakes, 99–101

Hecate, 118, 122, 124–27

Hekaleia at Marathon, 48–49

Heracles

at Athens, 367n8

at Lindus, 310

at Sicyon, 165n43

heroes as a class, 95, 165

Kotytia, 61–62

Kyklôpes at Isthmus, 250

Leto at Phaestus, 324–25

Mêtêr

at Athens, 137

at Olympia, 73–77, 79–81

Nymphs at Athens, 206–9

Semnai Theai at Athens, 89n10, 105–7, 110–12, 114–18, 127

Skirophoria at Athens, 110, 200, 206–10

Tritopatreis, 168, 175–78

Zeus

agoraios at Athens, 37–38

Buphonia (*Dipolieia*) at Athens, 227–28

epidôtas at Sparta, 150

eumenês on Chios?, 87n4, 98–99

kataibatês, 235n29, 238, 241–43, 246–47

keraunobolos at Tegea, 241

milichios, 82

- at Argos, [143](#), [151](#)
- at Athens, [111–12](#), [143–49](#), [153](#)
- at Locri, [143](#), [150–51](#)
- at Selinus, [143](#), [152–53](#), [253n2](#)
- at Siris, [151–52](#)
- Olympic Games, [70](#)
- Septêria* at Delphi, [243–45](#)
- Zeus and Athena
- Synoikia* at Athens, [312n46](#)
- Agathos Daimôn*, [98n59](#)
- agora
 - and early settlement at Athens, [205](#)
 - grave and monument of Battus at Cyrene, [158](#), [291–92](#)
 - circular altar at Cyrene, [164](#), [294–95](#)
 - civic offices at Cyrene, [366](#)
 - cults at Cyrene, [282](#)
 - Demeter and Poseidon at Argos, [117–18](#)
 - Demeter at Cyrene, [293–94](#)
 - lead tablet displayed there?, [36–38](#), [50](#), [216](#), [223–24](#)
 - roofed chamber at Poseidonia, [158](#)
 - tithed person sold at Cyrene, [301](#)
 - Zeus *milichios* at Argos, [151](#)
- Agra*, [79](#), [129](#), [134–41](#), [148–49](#), [199](#), [205–6](#), [211](#)
- Agrigentum, [254](#)
- Ain Hofra, [93–94](#), [165](#), [308–9](#), [315](#)
- Aiôra*, III
- Akamantes*, [9](#), [11](#), [164](#), [171–75](#), [280](#), [287–97](#), [300](#)
- alastôr*, *alastoros*, [230–32](#)
- Alcibiades, [57–60](#)
- Alcmaeonidae, [145–47](#), [149](#)
- altars
 - Ain Hofra, [93–94](#), [165](#)
 - Akamantes*, [293–95](#)
 - Altar of Pity, [37–38](#)
 - Aphrodite *pandêmos*, [163n33](#)
 - Apollo at Delphi, [43n3](#)
 - ash altar of Zeus at Olympia, [72](#), [79](#), [163](#)
 - Athena on Acropolis, [147](#)
 - beside threshing floor, [49](#)
 - circular, [159n15](#), [164](#), [172](#), [287](#), [294–95](#)
 - cleansing at Cyrene, [287](#), [296–97](#)
 - Demeter *malophoros*, [202](#)
 - Eileithyia at Olympia, [77](#)
 - Euthycles at Locri, [150–51](#)
 - Hera at Olympia, [78n39](#)
 - Heracles at Olympia, [79](#)
 - Hermes *agoraios* at Athens, [146n11](#)
 - Heudanemoi* at Athens, [295M4](#)
 - used for household offerings, [41–45](#), [50–51](#)
 - Kurêtes* at Olympia, [79](#)
 - Kyklôpes* at Isthmus, [250](#)
 - Moirai* near Sicyon, [96](#)
 - monthly circuit at Olympia, [78–79](#)

Mother at Olympia, 71–72, 78, 80, 82
 Nymphs at Athens, 206
 Pluto, 163n23
 “public altar” in tablet, 36–37, 50–51, 213–14, 216, 218, 222–24, 245, 249
 Semnai Theai, 92, 111–12, 114, 147–48
 Twelve Gods at Olympia, 75, 78, 81n50
 Zeus *agoraios*, 37–38, 224n40
 Zeus *elasteros* on Paros, 235–37
 Zeus *kataibatês* at Athens, 246
 Zeus *milichios* at Athens, 131, 210
 at Selinus, 186, 189–91, 193
 Zeus *polieus* at Athens, 227
 Altis, 69–71, 73, 75–76, 78–79, 82
 Amyclae
 Eumenides depicted, 94n38, 97
 Hyakinthia, 208, 311–312
 ancestors, 5–6, 110, 130, 131n11, 156, 159, 168, 172n18, 175–76, 283n13
 See also kinship group in charge of cult
 animal sacrifice
 goat, 49n27, 139, 189n8, 204, 244n7, 281–84, 319, 322, 330, 337–40, 342, 344, 350
 ox (cow, bull etc.), 33, 38n39, 48n26, 96n46, 153, 161, 162n29, 173, 195nn39, 44, 207–8, 212, 227–28, 309–13, 315
 pig, 160, 186, 193–95, 211, 213–14, 217–18, 223–24, 227–28, 245, 281, 297, 302, 365, 367
 sheep (ewe, ram etc.), 74, 81, 86, 96, 112, 115–16, 134, 135n26, 148n18, 160, 170–71, 173, 185, 188–89, 191, 193, 195, 203–4, 211, 281–82, 303
 Anthestêria, 111
 Apaturia, 229, 236–37, 312n46
 Aphrodite
 on Acropolis north slope, 197
 altar mislocated, 146n11
 festival, 197
 at “Horse-unbridling”, 131n10, 206n23
 at Naucratis, 133
 at Nike bastion, 163n3
 at Selinus, 61–62, 64
 Apollo
 at Amyclae, 311–312
 at Asine, 311–15
 at Athens, 48n26, 137n6, 139–40
 at Corinth, 32
 at Cyrene, 7–11, 279–86, 292n11, 293n4, 299–305, 307–9, 315–17, 319–22, 353–54, 356, 362–64, 366, 368, 371
 at Delphi, 43n3, 104, 243–44
 festivals, 38n39, 48n26, 49n27, 140n48 (see also *Boêdromia*, *Hyakinthia*, *Karneia*)
 identified with Helios, 175–76
 latecomer to Greek pantheon, 336
 at Lindus, 282, 311, 314–15
 at Marathon, 49n27
 month *Apollônios*, 66n65
 at Oaxus, 38n39, 283, 316
 at Olympia, 78n39

- in Orphic poetry, [91n21](#), [125](#)
- on rattling cup, [133](#)
- at Selinus, [94](#)
- at Thoricus, [121n66](#)
- Xenophon's sacrifice, [193](#)
- Apollonia port of Cyrene, [281](#), [373](#)
- Arcadia, [75](#), [77](#), [100](#), [241](#), [250](#), [339](#)
- Areopagus, [92](#), [106–7](#), [109](#), [112–15](#)
- Ariadne, [324](#), [328–29](#), [350](#)
- Artemis
 - in Agra, [109n14](#), [116n39](#), [129](#), [135–36](#), [138–41](#)
 - in Attic demes, [121n66](#)
 - at Corinth, [11](#)
 - at Cyrene, [7–9](#), [280](#), [284](#), [286](#), [300–301](#), [305](#), [317](#), [319–51](#), [354](#), [356](#)
 - Dorian cults, [58](#)
 - at Eleusis, [202](#)
 - festivals, [11](#), [140–41](#) (see also *Boêdromia*, *Braurônia*, *Munichia*, *Panêma*)
 - “fire festivals”, [245](#)
 - in Melite, [206](#), [224](#)
 - at Olympia, [78n39](#)
 - ritual baths, [59](#)
 - at Sicyon, [151](#)
 - spring and summer festivals, [90n17](#)
 - on Thasos, [236–37](#)
- Athena
 - in Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, [106](#), [109–14](#), [116–17](#)
 - at Athens, [233n20](#), [309n25](#), [332](#), [345–46](#)
 - birth of, [244](#)
 - contest with Poseidon, [246](#)
 - at Corinth, [60n34](#)
 - at Cyrene, [281–83](#)
 - at Erchia, [174](#)
 - in Euripides' *Erechtheus*, [207–11](#)
 - at Lindus, [254n4](#), [309n6](#), [311](#), [315](#)
 - at Olympia, [78n39](#)
 - at Pergamum, [285n22](#)
 - at Phalerum, [341n79](#)
 - rouses Theseus, [328](#)
 - at Sparta, [133n19](#), [146–47](#), [149–50](#)
 - on Thasos, [236–38](#)
 - tritogeneia*, [180](#)
 - See also *Plyntêria*
- Athens
 - correspondences with Selinus
 - festival of *Semnai Theai* = *Eumenides*, [105–27](#)
 - festival of Zeus *milichios*, [48](#), [138](#), [143–49](#)
 - Tritopatreis*, [167–80](#), [184](#)
 - Zeus *kataibatês* compared with *elasteros*, [241](#), [245–47](#)
 - Zeus *milichios* at harvest time, [199–200](#), [205](#), [210–12](#)
 - correspondences with Cyrene
 - Bear priestess, [338–42](#)
 - purification of suppliants by *Eupatridae*, [356–57](#), [366–68](#)
- Attica, [10](#), [106–7](#), [120](#), [122](#), [141](#), [148–49](#), [169](#), [173](#), [246](#), [332](#)

- unification, [312n46](#)
- See also [Brauron](#), [Eleusis](#), [Erchia](#), [Marathon](#), [Munichia](#), [Peiraeus](#), [Thoricus](#)
- autophonos*, [6](#), [214–15](#), [226](#), [364–65](#), [368–69](#)
- autorektas*, [4–6](#), [27–28](#), [214–15](#), [225–27](#)
- axôn*, [33](#), [36](#)
- Axus. See [Oaxus](#)
- Ayios Georghios, [314](#)

Baal, [251n104](#)

- Baal Hammon, [191–92](#)

Battus, [7](#), [287–88](#), [290–94](#), [316](#)

- See also [agora](#), [kinship group in charge of cult](#)

Bear priestess, [322n5](#), [330](#), [334–35](#), [337–42](#), [344](#), [350](#)

- bear (animal), [319](#), [338](#), [350–51](#)
- bear boy, [340–41](#)
- little Bears, [320](#), [329](#), [332nn49–50](#), [333](#), [340–41](#), [345–50](#)

Boêdromia, [139–40](#)

booths, [229](#), [242–45](#), [247](#)

Boreas at Athens, [180–84](#)

boys

- in prenuptial custom, [273](#), [319](#), [324–29](#), [337](#), [340–41](#), [350](#)
- ritual officiants, [244n77](#)

Brauron, [121 n66](#), [319](#), [322](#), [329–30](#), [332–34](#), [337](#), [339–42](#), [344–49](#)

Braurônia, [330](#), [332](#), [339–40](#), [342](#), [344](#), [349](#)

Briareôs, [177–78](#), [180–81](#), [183](#)

brides, bridal customs, [280](#), [286](#), [302](#), [305](#), [319–34](#)

- bridal belt, [323–25](#)

bronze as writing material, [32–33](#), [82](#)

Bryas of Argos, [143](#), [151](#)

Byzantium, [150n22](#)

- calendar, [55n7](#), [294n19](#)

calendars of sacrifice, [3–4](#), [10](#), [38](#), [86–87](#)

- Athens (compendious, c. 400 B.C.), [237n53](#), [248](#)
- Acropolis, [135](#), [138](#)
- genos* Butadae?, [169–70](#), [172](#), [173](#)
- genos* Salaminii, [341n79](#)

Attic demes

- Eleusis, [121n64](#)
- Erchia, [121n66](#), [157n2](#), [303n10](#)
- Marathon, [49n27](#)
- Marathon (Tetrapolis), [49n27](#), [56n14](#), [120](#), [160](#), [171](#), [172–74](#), [235](#), [289](#)
- Paiania, [121](#)
- Thoricus, [121n66](#), [218n14](#), [246](#)

Corinth, [32–33](#)

Cos, [303n11](#)

Eleutherna, [311n37](#)

Myconos, [121n64](#)

Callatis, [60](#), [222](#)

Camarina, [254n5](#)

Carbina, [242–43](#)

carrying away meat, [9](#), [171](#), [173](#), [185](#), [188–89](#), [283](#), [299–301](#), [303–4](#), [307](#), [309](#), [315](#), [317](#), [320](#)

Carthage, Carthaginians, 6, 192, 254–55

See also 182n70

Chersonesus (Black Sea city), 55n7, 60

childbirth, 7–8, 285–86, 320, 337–38, 342, 349–50

Choes, 110

Chusor, 192

Cleidemus

on Agra, 136–37

on battle with Amazons, 139–40

on Nine Gates, 115

Cleisthenes, 146, 173, 195

Cnidus, 36n31, 140, 361

Colonus, 98, 106–9, 112, 115, 117, 125

Corinth, 90n17, 111n20, 134, 250, 290, 314

inscriptions, 34n20

Kotytô, 57–58, 60, 64

Cos, 223n34, 282n10, 303n11

cost-saving measures

admission to Eleusinian Mysteries, 11

piglet as victim, 37, 160, 193–94, 214, 218, 227–28, 245, 365

priest dispensed with, 156, 160, 162, 291–92

reduced hospitality, 37, 50, 214, 217–18, 224, 228, 229, 361, 364–65

ritual conducted at home, 43, 49, 160, 185–89, 196–97, 217

sop ‘n’ salt as offering, 43–51, 54–55

trivial magic, 357–61

vegetable offerings, 353, 363

Craterus collector of Athenian decrees

on Bear service, 345, 347–48

Croton, 151–52

Cylon, story of, 114n32, 115, 135, 137, 143–53

Cyrene, 259–374

Dactyls, 35, 68, 79

Daimones, 98n59

death

in the family, 286

premature or violent, 359

of tithed person, 305–7

Delos, 294n23

Delphi

cults and festivals, 219n21, 281n6

oracle, 101n69, 104, 108, 111, 133–34, 137, 145, 147, 151, 227–28, 279–80, 282, 292, 300–301, 308, 311–13, 315–16, 322, 326, 362–63

See also Ephyra Demeter, 11, 36, 38, 49

in Agra, 129, 135, 138–39

at Argos, 117

in Attic demes, 49n28, 228n53, 235n34, 289, 294

at Cnidus, 361

at Colonus, 109

on Cos, 223n34

at Cyrene, 293–94

etymology of name, 120n57

festivals, 121–22, 172 (see also *Malophoria*, *Proërosia*, *Skira*, *Thalysia*)

- at Gela, 64043, 91
- as “golden” grain, 204
- gravid victims, 96n46
- at Hermione, 98n57
- and Iasion, 242n72
- at Lete, 331
- malophoros*, 49n28, 103n77, 163n35, 185, 190–91, 199–205, 249
- on Mykonos, 121n64
- at Nike bastion, 109, 114
- in Orphic poetry, 101–2, 104
- at Phalanna, 332
- at Phlya, 106, 109
- and Rhea, 123–24
- at Scirum, 209–10
- at Syracuse, 91
- on Thasos, 236
- at Thelpusa, 89n8
- See also [Eleusis](#), [Eleusinian Mysteries](#)
- Dēmia* (rites at Athens), 200–201, 205–6, 209, 211–12
- democrats, II
 - at Athens, 320, 329, 345, 348–49
 - at Cyrene, 373
 - at Selinus, 254
- Demon
 - on *Tritopatreis*, 175–76
- Diasia* (*Dia*), 82, 86–88, 111, 138, 143–53
- Dionysus
 - in Acropolis calendar, 138n42
 - biennial cycle, 196
 - at Callatis, 222
 - at Delphi, 247
 - en limnais*, 189n8
 - festivals, 189n8, 222n32, 328–29
 - goat sacrifice, 282n10
 - with Hermes and Nymphs, 206, 208
 - at Lindus, 310–11, 315
 - on Naxos, 328
 - no newcomer to Greece, 64n54
 - at Olympia, 78n39
 - in Orphic rites and poetry, 91, 104, 123, 127, 139, 234
 - at Patrae, 326–27, 329
 - ritual baths, 59
 - served by *Euneidai*, 240
- Dorians
 - cults of Apollo, 140, 282–83, 311, 315
 - cults of *Eumenides*, 85, 87–88, 95, 98–99
 - homosexuality, 305
 - Kotytia*, 53, 57–58, 64, 82
 - magic formulas, 359n17, 361
- Dryopians, 312–16

economical alternatives. See [cost-saving measures](#)
 Eileithyia at Olympia, 71n7, 75–78

elasteros, 4–6, 42, 50, 164, 213–27, 229–39, 245, 359, 361, 364–65, 368–69
festival alleged, 224

Elea, 230, 235

Elis, 55, 66, 70, 73, 75

Eleusis, Eleusinian Mysteries

buildings and monuments, 90n14, 163n33, 295n24

priesthoods, 61n36, 62n43, 121–22, 293

ritual, 91n24, 160n21, 177, 224n40, 347 (See also cost-saving measures)

story of Demeter and *Korê*, 89n10, 102, 202

story of Erechtheus and Eumolpus, 228n53

Empedocles, 253n2, 254

Entella, 165n41

Enyalios, 140

ephebes enrolled as citizens, 311–312

Ephyra equated with Delphi, 314

Epicharmus, 61n35, 195n44, 304

Epidaurus, 312–13, 315

Epimenides, 107n4, 134n23, 145–46

Erchia, 110n16, 121n66, 148n18, 228n53, 303n10

Êrignonê, 111

Erôs, 197

Eumenês. See *heroes*

Eumenides, 4–6, 38, 85–104, 106–8, 125, 127, 293

festival, 36, 38, 49, 85–87, 90–91, 92, 94, 96, 100–101, 104, 129, 187

Euphron on parentage of *Eumenides*, 125–27

Eupolis, 57–62

Eupatridae, 116n38, 356–57, 366–68

Euryleon, 37, 223

Euthydamos, 86, 129–33, 159, 185–88, 190, 197, 199–201, 205, 212

famine, 124, 150, 281, 283, 374

famine years (330–325 B.C.), 7, 259, 371, 373

festivals

See *Adônia*, *Anthestêria*, *Apaturia*, *Boêdromia*, *Braurônia*, *Diasia*, Eleusinian Mysteries, *Galaxia*, *Halôa*, *Hellôtia*, *Hyakinthia*, *Karneia*, *Kotyia*, *Kronia*, *Malophoria*, *Munichia*, *Panêma*, *Plyntêria*, *Proêrosia*, *Saturnalia*, *Septêria*, *Skira*, *Skirophoria*, *Synoikia*, *Taurea*, *Terminalia*, *Thalysia*

See also *Apollo*, *Artemis*, *Athena*, *Demeter*, *elasteros*, *Eumenides*, *Hera*, *Persephone*, *Poseidon*, *Semnai Theai*, *Zeus*

fig, 210n43, 294, 345–46

footraces

of Dactyls at Olympia, 79

of girls at Brauron, 333–34, 348–50

of girls at Olympia, 333

of new brides, 333

Gaggera hill, 163n35, 165n41, 185, 187–93, 199, 202, 204

Galaxia, 69, 77–78, 80–81, 137–38, 140

Galepsus, 237

gardens, 197n52

Gela, 64n53, 91–92, 95, 99, 108, 132–33, 293

genos. See 82n54, 96n46, 207n33, 346n89, 371–72

grain bins, 44, 46–49

grape, vine, new wine, [189n8](#), [208n36](#), [222n32](#), [282n10](#), [321n1](#), [326n22](#), [328](#)

Hades. *See* [Pluto](#)

Halôa, [45n13](#), [121n64](#)

Hecate, [90](#), [105](#), [118–27](#), [195](#), [202](#), [217](#), [360](#)

Helios, [119](#), [175–76](#), [211](#), [250](#)

Hellôtia, [60](#)

Hephaestus, [192](#)

Hera

at Argos (Heraeum), [98n57](#)

and *Daira*, [122n68](#)

festivals, [332n46](#), [333](#)

“fire festivals”, [245](#)

milichia, [192](#)

at Olympia, [78n39](#), [81–82](#), [333](#)

prenuptial affair, [324](#), [328](#)

ritual baths, [59](#)

ritual begging, [197n2](#)

at Selinus, [163n5](#), [200n2](#), [201n4](#)

teleia, [332n46](#)

Heracleidae, [37](#), [60](#), [314–15](#)

Heracles

in Athens’ civic calendar, [170](#), [209](#)

deified hero, [165](#) “fire festivals”, [245](#)

at Lesser Mysteries, [367n58](#)

at Lindus, [310](#)

at Olympia, [75](#), [78–79](#)

as outcast, [299–300](#), [313–14](#)

at *Porthmos*, [161n26](#), [341n79](#)

at Selinus, [165n1](#), [200n2](#), [225](#)

at Sicyon, [194n34](#)

on Thasos, [161](#)

and Tlepolemus, [101](#)

Hermes

at Athens, [145–46](#)

begets bastard, [316](#)

divides meat, [161](#)

at Olympia, [78n39](#)

Orphic *Hymn*?, [91n20](#)

heroes, [94–95](#), [130–31](#), [155–56](#), [159–60](#), [164–65](#), [171](#), [173](#), [225](#), [288–89](#), [291](#), [295](#)

Epôpeus, [110n16](#)

Epops, [110n16](#)

Eumenês, [87n4](#), [88–99](#)

Eurypylus, [328n31](#)

Eurysakês, [173](#)

“Hero”, “Heroes”, [170](#), [172–73](#)

Hêrôes, [209](#)

Hêsychos, [115–16](#)

Hyttênios, [172](#)

Leukaspis, [173](#)

Orestes, 100
Pelops, 74–75, 78, 81
Skiros, 172n16, 173
See also Heracles, Theseus
Hêsychidai. See kinship group in charge of cult
hierophant, 91–92, 98, 240, 293
hikesios, 363n41
Hill of the Nymphs. See 254n4, 255, 361
Hipponium, 96n48
homicide, 156n1, 200n1, 302n7, 354–55, 357–58, 364, 367nn58–59, 368
See also purification
Homonoia, 283n13
homosêpyoi, *homosipyoi*, 42, 47–49
honey-mix. See libation hospitality. See table
hospitality household, 5, 41–51, 141, 146, 158, 197, 218, 286, 357–61
household gods, 150, 229, 237–38, 241–42, 244–46, 249
Hundred-handers, 168, 174, 177–78, 180–81, 183, 235, 250
Hyakinthia, 208, 311–12, 315
Hyakinthos (Hill of the Nymphs), 199–200, 206–11
Hyakinthides. See Nymphs
Hyrnetho, 315

Iasion, 242
Ilissus, 116n39, 149n19, 152, 171, 181, 205, 281, 332
initiation rites, 59n29, 324n14, 325n18, 333n51, 34n76, 342n80, 348n105, 349
cult of *Korybantēs* at Erythrae, 59
cult of *Mêtêr*, 82
Ixion, 242n72, 251

jujube, 62

Karneia, 134n22, 139n43
kinship group in charge of cult, 62n42, 130–31, 156, 160, 162, 167, 169–72, 173,
177, 179–80, 210, 227–28, 341–43
Battidai and *Onymastidai*, 280, 287, 289–96
Hêsychidai, 195n43
Phytalidai, 293n18
Kombothekra, 73
Konnaros or *Konnidas*, 61–62
Korê. See *Persephone Kotytia*, 53–64, 82
Kronia, *Kronion*, *Kronos*, 62n43, 63–64, 67, 69–71, 75–83, 126, 136–37, 248
Kubaba, 73
Kurotrophos, 172, 289
kurotrophos (Eleusinian officiant), 121–22
kyrbis, 33, 36

lads (as offenders among tithed class), 302–3, 305, 323
lead as writing material, 4, 31–35, 253
Leto, 324–25, 329, 336
Leukaspis. See heroes
libation, 108, 117, 133, 155, 157–61, 171, 173–174, 207, 236, 353, 361, 363, 368
melikraton (honey-mix), 96, 155, 157, 159, 160, 207, 236, 368

Libya, [306n19](#), [317](#), [320](#), [363](#), [373](#)
lightning, [37n34](#), [98n61](#), [178](#), [220–21](#), [225](#), [229–30](#), [232–36](#), [238–51](#), [369](#)
Lindus, [254n4](#), [355n6](#), [365–68](#)
Locri, [96n48](#), [103](#), [119](#), [143](#), [146](#), [150–51](#), [361](#)
Locris, West, [140](#)

magic, [8–9](#), [226](#), [245](#), [329](#), [350](#)
 animal ally (bear), [338](#), [341–42](#), [350–51](#)
 contact, [111–12](#), [324](#)
 figurines, images, [283–84](#), [319](#), [324–25](#), [335](#), [342](#)
 left and right, [35](#)
 ninefold, [161](#)

private acts, [5](#), [34–35](#)

public ritual, [114n32](#), [172n16](#), [239–40](#)

 red hair, [7](#), [281](#), [283–84](#)

 sympathy, [186](#), [197](#), [202](#)

 weather, [233n23](#), [242n72](#)

Malophoria, [49n28](#), [199–200](#), [206](#), [209](#)

Marathon, [37n37](#), [56n14](#), [138n42](#), [145n10](#), [288n3](#), [289](#), [294](#)

marriage. *See* [brides Megacles](#), [112](#), [145–46](#)

Megalopolis

 cult of Callisto, [339n67](#)

 cult of Isis and Sarapis, [285n21](#)

 precinct of Boreas, [182](#)

 shrine of *Eumenides*, [134n23](#)

Megara, [34n20](#), [49n28](#), [131n7](#), [294n19](#)

 Megara Hyblaea, [190](#), [205](#)

melikraton. *See* [libation](#)

men and women worshipping together. *See* [women and men worshipping together](#)

Metapontum, [151–52](#)

milichios stones. *See* [Zeus](#)

miscarriage, [7](#), [286](#), [300](#), [320](#), [337](#)

Moirai, [88](#)

 at Cyrene, [281](#)

 at Delphi, [281n6](#)

 at Selinus, [90](#)

 near Sicyon, [96–97](#), [108](#)

Mother, *Mêtêr*

 beside and beyond Ilissus, [135–38](#)

 in Euripides' *Helen*, [105](#), [120](#), [124–25](#)

 no latecomer to Greece, [59](#), [63–64](#)

 at Olympia, [64](#), [67–68](#), [69–83](#), [248](#)

 at Phaestus, [325n17](#)

 ritual begging, [197n52](#)

See also [Galaxia](#), [Kronia Munichia](#), [211](#), [319](#), [322](#), [329–30](#), [338](#), [341–45](#), [348](#)

Munichia (festival), [90n17](#), [336](#)

Munichos (hero), [342–43](#)

Myconos, [121n64](#), [282n10](#)

Myskos, [86](#), [94](#), [129–34](#), [141](#), [143](#), [152](#), [159](#), [187](#), [190](#), [199–200](#)

Nacone, [90n17](#), [283n13](#)

Naucratis, [133](#)

ninth portion, [155–56](#), [161–62](#), [189](#)

Nisaia, [190](#)

Nymphs

- Artemis' companions, 322n9, 334, 349–50
- at Athens (*Hyakinthides*), 170, 174, 199–200, 205–9, 211–12
- at Cyrene, 294n23
- on Delos, 159, 164, 171–72
- on Thasos, 236–37

Oaxus, Axus, 38n39, 196, 283, 316, 325

Oenomaus, 72, 79, 238

oligarchs, 11, 151

- Cyrene, 372–73

- Selinus, 254

olive growing, 246–48

Olympia, 69–82, 163, 238, 248–49, 333

Onymastus, 287–88, 290, 292

See also kinship group in charge of cult

Orestes. *See* heroes

Orphic texts

- rites, 118n46

- stories, 115n35, 120, 122–27, 167–68, 177, 229, 232, 234

Panêma, 90n17

Paros, 223n39, 232n17, 235, 237–39

Pasikrateia, 86, 103–4

Pausanias of Sparta, 146n12, 149–51

Peiraeus, 210–11, 341

pelanos, 45, 202

Pelagians, 136n1, 332, 345, 348–49

Pelops. *See* heroes

Pericles, 146–47, 149

Persephone

- in Agra, 129, 139

- at Argos, 117–18

- in Euripides' *Helen*, 120

- festivals, 96, 103–4, 139

- in *Hymn to Demeter*, 102–3, 120, 122

- at Locri, 119

- in Orphic texts, 85–86, 91, 101–2, 104, 123, 125–27

- at Selinus, 86, 90, 103

Phaestus, 82n53, 324–25

- hero, 165n43

Phalasarna, 361 Phanodemus

- on Erechtheus' daughters, 207

- on Iphigeneia, 339–40

- on *Tritopatreis*, 175–76, 180

Phayllus of Croton, 151

Philochorus

- on abducted Bears, 332, 345, 348

- on *Kronia*, 82–83, 137

- on *Tritopatreis*, 175–76, 179

Phlya, 106, 109, 112

Phoenicia, Phoenicians, 90n17, 192

Phyalidai. *See* kinship group in charge of cult

piglet as victim. *See* [cost-saving measures](#)

Plataea, [244n81](#)

Plato

on *Agra*, [135](#)

on Aphrodite and *Erôs*, [197](#)

on executioner's cast-offs, [207n29](#)

on homicide pollution, [368](#)

on magic and superstition, [360n27](#)

on marriage rites, [351n109](#)

on Orphic genealogy, [125–26](#)

Pluto, [163n33](#)

Plutos, [94](#), [122](#)

Plyntêria, [170](#)

pollution. *See* [purification](#)

pompê. *See* [processions](#)

popanon, [45](#)

Poseidon

at Argos, [117](#), [119](#)

at Athens (Acropolis), [110n16](#), [200](#), [206–9](#), [246](#)

in *Agra*, [135–40](#)

father-in-law of *Briareôs*, [178](#), [183](#)

festivals, [49n27](#), [138–40](#)

at Marathon, [49n27](#)

at Olympia, [78n39](#)

ritual baths, [59](#)

solstice festival, [63–64](#)

Zeus' rival, [233](#)

See also [Halôa](#), [Taurea](#)

Poseidonia (Paestum), [158](#)

pregnancy, [286](#), [334–38](#), [342–44](#)

priests, [9](#), [59](#), [92](#), [98–99](#), [104](#), [121](#), [151](#), [207](#), [211](#), [227](#), [243](#), [284](#), [288](#), [291–92](#), [296](#), [303](#), [354](#), [364](#), [366–68](#)

priestess, [82n53](#), [114n32](#), [122](#), [268](#), [293](#), [335](#)

priestly perquisite, [109–10](#), [121](#), [160](#), [170](#), [172](#), [209](#)

See also [Bear priestess](#), [hierophant](#), [kinship group in charge of cult](#)

processions

from Acropolis to Scirum, [49n28](#), [235n34](#), [326](#)

for Artemis *agrotera*, [139](#)

for Artemis at Patrae, [326–27](#)

for Athena on Acropolis, [109](#)

carrying *eiresiônê*, [63n6](#)

for Demeter at Bel Gadir, [293–94](#)

for Demeter at Eleusis, [62n43](#), [65n59](#), [119n50](#), [122](#)

for Demeter on *Gaggera*, [199](#), [202–5](#)

for *Eumenides* at Gela, [92](#), [108](#)

for Nymphs at Athens, [200](#), [205](#), [212](#)

for *Semnai Theai* at Athens, [92](#), [108–10](#), [112–17](#)

wearing necklace of dried figs, [345–46](#)

for Zeus at Delphi, [243–44](#), [247](#)

Proêrosia, [46n15](#)

Ptolemy (Soter)

diagramma, [303](#), [317](#), [320](#), [373](#)

Punic, [36n30](#), [62](#), [90](#), [159](#), [190–92](#), [202](#)

purification, 4–9, 34, 209, 213–27, 232, 283, 296–97, 299–302, 307, 320, 353–69
 with blood, 224n40, 297, 301–2, 367
 of bloodshed, 5–6, 112, 130, 145, 151, 156, 215, 217, 220–21, 224, 226, 231, 243–44, 355, 357–58, 362, 364, 368
 after bodily functions, 7–8, 285–86, 320

Rhea, 328n26
 See also Mother, *Mêtêr* Rhodes, 372
 Apollo *pythaeus*, 311, 313–14, 316
 Eumenides, 85, 92, 95, 98, 101
 ritual conducted at home. *See* cost-saving measures

sacrifice. *See* animal sacrifice

sanctuaries
 Apaturia area on Thasos, 236–37
 Apollo and Artemis at Cyrene, 7–8, 279–81, 301–2, 321–23, 335, 337, 362–63, 365–68
 Artemis at Brauron, 340, 348
 at Munichia, 341
 Asclepius below Acropolis, 116n35
 Demeter at Gela, 91

Demeter at Cyrene
 agora, 294
 Bel Gadir, 293
 Dionysus *en limnais*, 189n8
 Eumenides near Ceryneia, 98
 Eumenides near Megalopolis, 97, 100
 Nymphs at Hill so called, 206–9, 212
 Semnai Theai at Colonus, 98, 106–8
 Zeus at Tegea, 241
 Zeus *milichios* at Hill of the Nymphs, 199–200, 206, 211–12
 at Thespieae, 98
 See also Ain Hofra, Delos, Delphi, *Gaggera* hill, Olympia

Saturnalia, 63, 82

Selinus, 15–252

Semnai Theai, 105–27, 145, 147–48, 240
 festival, 92, 108–16

Septêria, 219n21, 243–45, 247

sexual intercourse, 7–8, 120, 123, 285–86, 302, 320, 323, 336

Sicyon
 Epôpeus, 110n16
 Eumenides, 93–94, 95–96, 97, 102, 106, 108
 Heracles, 194n4
 tomb of Eupolis, 60n31
 Zeus *milichios*, 151

Siris, 182n72

Skira, 49n28, 56n14, 228n53, 235n34, 289, 294

Skirophoria, 49n28, 235n34, 346n89

solstices, 38–39, 49, 55–56, 63–67, 69, 80, 81–82, 86, 249

sop ‘n’ salt, 41–46, 50, 55
 See also cost-saving measures

Sparta, 89n8, 100n67, 281n7, 355n7, 359n17

suppliants, 146n13, 148–50, 215, 223–24, 236, 308

Seeking purification, 9, 110, 226, 231, 244, 317, 320, 353–69
Synoikia, 237n53, 312n46
Syracuse, 47n22, 359n17, 360

Taenarum, 147, 149–50, 373

table hospitality, 5, 29, 37, 50, 155, 161, 186, 214–18, 221–222, 224, 227–28, 229–30, 360–61, 364–65, 368

See also *theoxenia*

Tanit, 191–92, 202

Tarentum

founded by bastards, 312, 315

Zeus *kataibatês*, 242–43, 244–45, 246

Taurea, 139n3

Tegea, 100, 241, 245, 247–48

Telestes of Selinus, 64, 67, 74–75, 79, 82

Telos

Eumenides, 95, 98, 101

temples

Apollo at Corinth, 32

Apollo at Cyrene, 285–86, 363

Apollo at Delphi, 243, 322, 362

Apollo at Halieis, 282

Apollo *delphinios* at Athens, 48n26

Apollo *delphinios* at Chalcis, 316n59

Artemis at Aulis, 322

Artemis at Brauron, 322, 340

Artemis at Cyrene, 321–23

Artemis at Halae, 322

Artemis at Munichia, 322, 342

Athena at Lindus, 283

Artemis at Patrae, 326

Athena (Old Temple) on Acropolis,

Athena on Acropolis (*Nikê*), on Areopagus (*Areia*), at Ilissus (*Palladion*), 116n39, 136, 332

Demeter and others at Phlya, 106, 109

Demeter *malophoros* at Selinus, 64, 191, 201–2

Eileithyia at Olympia, 75–78

Eumenides near Sicyon, 96

Hera at Olympia, 70–72, 81–82

Heracles? at Selinus, 165n41

Hermes *agoraios*? at Athens, 146n11

Mêtêr at Olympia, 70–72, 74–75, 78, 80–81

Mêtêr (*Kronos* and *Rhea*) at Athens, 79, 137

Mêtêr (*Mêtrôon*) at Athens, 80

Tyche at Athens, 136

Zeus? at Cyrene, 282

Zeus at Olympia, 70–71, 74–75, 79

Zeus *milichios* at Selinus, 191

Zeus *olympios* at Athens, 79, 137

Terminalia, 118

Thalysia, **Theiluthia*, 49

Thasos, 144n3, 151n28, 232n17, 235–38, 247

Theagenes of Megara, 145

- of Thasos, [150n25](#)
- Thebes, [37](#), [107](#), [132](#), [201](#), [308](#)
- theoxenia*, [160–61](#), [164–65](#), [189](#), [217](#), [361](#)
 - See also [table hospitality](#)
- Thera, [62n43](#), [89n8](#), [131n7](#), [283–84](#), [315–16](#), [373](#)
- Theseus, [145n10](#), [312n46](#), [324](#), [327–29](#), [350](#)
- Thibron, [373–74](#)
- Thoricus, [121n66](#), [148n18](#), [218n14](#), [228n53](#), [239](#), [246](#)
- Thrace, [237](#), [255](#)
 - no connection with *Kotyia*, [56–58](#), [60](#)
 - land of winter in story-telling, [207n33](#), [208](#)
- Timaeus
 - on Boreas at Thurii, [182](#)
 - on bloodshed at Siris, [151–52](#)
 - on democracy in Sicily, [254](#)
 - on “snatching” at Selinus, [61–62](#)
- Tiryns
 - Eumenides*, [90n15](#), [92](#), [95–97](#), [99](#), [101](#), [107–8](#)
- tithe, tithing, [7–9](#), [279](#), [283](#), [286](#), [296–97](#), [299–317](#), [319–20](#), [323](#), [337](#), [353–54](#), [356](#), [358](#), [362–63](#)
 - “tithe” = “consecrate”, [347](#)
- Tritopatreis*, *Tritopateres*, *Tritopatores*
 - according to grammarians, [179–80](#)
 - in “Aristotle”, [176–77](#)
 - at Athens, Erchia, Marathon, Troezen, on Delos, [38](#), [155–60](#), [169–75](#), [209](#), [281](#), [289–90](#)
 - in Attic chroniclers, [175–76](#)
 - at Cyrene, [7](#), [9](#), [11](#), [156](#), [164](#), [171–72](#), [174–75](#), [279](#), [287–97](#), [300](#)
 - meaning of name, [184](#)
 - in Orphic poem, [177](#)
 - at Selinus, [152n33](#), [155–65](#), [186–87](#), [189](#), [225](#), [236](#)
- trittoa*, [25–26](#), [186](#), [194–97](#)
- Troezen, [103n82](#), [313n50](#)
- visitants
 - at Cyrene, [8](#), [355–58](#), [361–62](#), [364](#)
 - at Selinus, [5](#), [8](#), [215](#)
- washing, [7](#), [77](#), [213](#), [217–18](#), [245](#), [285–86](#), [354](#), [356](#), [364](#), [367–68](#)
 - altar, [296–97](#)
 - animal intestines, [185–86](#), [188](#)
- weather, seasons, [110n16](#), [233n23](#), [242n72](#), [246–48](#), [289](#), [294](#)
- wind gods. See *Akamantes*, *Tritopatreis*
- women and men worshipping together
 - Athena, [345](#)
 - Demeter, [202](#)
 - Korybantes*, [59](#)
 - Kotyia*, [59–60](#)
 - Mother, [59](#)
 - Zeus *milichios*, [210](#)
- women worshipping alone
 - Artemis, [7–9](#), [280](#), [286](#), [300](#), [319–51](#)
 - Demeter, [293](#), [331–32](#)

Dionysus, 310

Eumenides, 85, 92, 96–98

Hecate, 360

Hera, 333

Korê, 96

Leto, 324–25

Moirai, 96–97, 108

Mother, 77

Semnai Theai, 98, 105, 108, 112, 114, 116, 125

wood

for general use, 7, 9, 279, 284–85

for making figurines, 353, 357, 359

Xenophon, 110n15, 227n49

sacrifice to Zeus *milichios*, 137n40, 160, 187, 193–94

Zeus

agoraios, 4, 37–38, 50, 223–24

eumenês, 4, 87–88, 98–99

hekaleios

festival, 48–49

at Ithome

festival, 228

kataibatês, 39, 225, 237, 239–48

as lightning god, 229–30, 233–49

festivals, 230, 246

See also *Septêria*

at Messene

festival, 228

milichios, 4–6, 11, 36–37, 48, 82, 93–94, 98, 127, 129–32, 138, 158–59, 199–201, 205–6, 210–12

festival, 38, 86–87, 105, 129, 187

See also *Diasia*

milichios stones, 185–97

at Mylasa

festival, 228

polieus

festival, 173, 227–8

See also *Olympia*

Select Index of Sources

Authors

Acusilaus *FGrH* 2

(fr. 42) 126

Aelian *Var. hist.*

(3.1) 243–44

(12.61) 181–82

(fr. 44) 293

Aeschylus

Choeph. (1049–50) 99–100

Eum. (128) 99, (236) 231, (834–36, 856–67) 114, (1003–47) 114, 116–17, (1041) 106

Prom. Vinc. (543–44) 244

Argeii (fr. 17) 246n84

Cressae (fr. 117) 226n47

Edoni (fr. 57) 57

Ixion (fr. 92) 230–31

Oreithyia (fr. 281) 181

Agathocles *FGrH* 472

(fr. 4) 62n41

Alexander Polyhistor

FGrH 460 (fr. 10) 316

Anecdota Bekker

(1.273) 136–137

(1.317) 179n48

Anonymus *Exêgêtikon*

FGrH 352 (fr. 1) 177

Antimachus (fr. 112) 102n70

Antiochus *FGrH* 555 (fr. 13) 312

Antiphanes *Boiôtia* (fr. 64) 304

Antoninus Liberalis *Met.*

(6) 241

(17) 324–25

Apollodorus of Athens *FGrH* 244

(fr. 109) 360n23

(fr. 120) 246

[Apollodorus] *Bibl.*

(1.3.1) 126

(2.7.7.3) 313

(3.15.8.3–4) 208

Apollonius of Acharnae *FGrH* 365

- (fr. 2) [45n13](#)
- (fr. 5) [144n2](#)
- Apollonius of Rhodes *Argon.*
(4.828–29) [126](#)
- Aristomenes Comicus
(fr. 14) [217n10](#)
- Aristophanes
Ach. (835) [44](#)
Lys. (640–47) [210n44](#), [345–46](#)
Nub. (408–11) [137](#), [144n1](#)
Pax (774–80, 796–801) [100](#)
- Aristotle
Ath. (1) [112](#), (3.5) [328](#), (20.2–3) [146](#), (58.1) [140](#)
Eth. Nic. (8.9.11, 1160a 32–28) [82](#)
Meteor. (2.4–6, 940a–947b) [176](#)
Pol. (1.2, 1252b) [46–48](#), (6.4, 1319b) [366](#)
(fr. 415) [176–77](#)
- Arrian *Succ. FGrH* 156 (fr. 9) [373n9](#)
- Athenaeus
(1.5, 3e) [152–53](#)
(9.10, 370c) [286n25](#)
- Bacchylides
Hymns (fr. 1b) [125](#)
Paeans (fr. 4) [313](#)
- Callimachus
Epigr. (35) 293III4
Hymns Ap. (96) 293III4
Art. (13–14, 42–43) [349](#)
Dem. (122–23) [204](#), (134–35) [44](#)
Zeus (3) [234](#), (94) [44](#)
Hecale (fr. 251) [49](#)
Aetia
1 (fr. 24) [313](#)
3 (fr. 75) 324, [328](#), (frs. 83–84) [150–51](#)
- Iambi*
3 (fr. 193) [201](#)
11 (fr. 201) [61–62](#)
(fr. 466) [124](#)
(fr. 587) [195n38](#)
(fr. 681) [96–97](#)
- Cicero (*Att.* 16.7) [67](#)
- Clearchus (fr. 48) 242–43, 246
- Cleidemus *FGrH* [323](#)
(fr. 1) [135–36](#)
(fr. 9) [136–37](#)
(fr. 14) [367n59](#) (fr. 15) [139–40](#)
(fr. 16) [115](#)
(fr. 25) [137](#)
- Comarchus *FGrH* 410 (fr. 1) [66n63](#)
- Cornutus *De nat. deor.* (9) [232](#)
- Craterus *FGrH* [342](#)

- (fr. 4) [347](#)
(fr. 9) [345](#), [347–48](#)

Demon *FGrH* 327 (fr. 2) [175–76](#), [179n54](#)

Demosthenes

- (18 *De cor.* 259) [82n53](#)
(23 *Aristocr.* 72) [368](#)
(24 *Timocr.* 26) [64](#)
(25 *Aristog. hyp.*) [334](#)
(43 *Macart.* 57) [216](#)
(fr. 7) [347](#)

Derveni Papyrus

- (vi) [91](#)
(vii) [123](#)
(x-xiii) [125](#)
(xvi-xix) [124](#)
(xxii) [120](#), [123](#)
(xxv-xxvi) [122–23](#)

Diodorus Siculus

- 4 (37.1–2) [314](#), (69.3) [238](#), (79.4) [254n4](#)
8 (32.2) [316n59](#)
11 (68.1, [5](#), 72.1–2, 76.4–6) [254](#)
12(80.2–3) [151](#)
14 (34) [372](#)
18 (19–21) [373n9](#)

Diogenes Laertius

- 1 (110, 112) [112](#), [134n23](#)
8 (53) [152–53](#), (70) [152](#)

Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom.*(1.67.3) [237](#)

Ephorus *FGrH* 70 (fr. 31b) [243–44](#)

Epicharmus

- (frs. 9–13) [6ln35](#)
(fr. 112) [304](#)
(fr. 182) [195n44](#)
(fr. 232) [50n29](#)

Eudemus (fr. 150) [125](#)

Eumelus (fr. 7) [250](#)

Euphoriion (fr. 94) [125–27](#)

Eupolis *Baptae* (frs. 76–98) [58–60](#)

Euripides

- El.* (1254–72) [107](#), (1273–75) [100](#)
Hel. (375–80) [339](#), (1301–52) [120](#), [124–25](#)
Heraclid. (79) [308](#)
Hipp. (318) [360–61](#)
Ion (376–77) [308](#), (434–35) [223n34](#)
Iph. Taur. (286) [99](#), (1462–67) [339n68](#), [340](#)
Or. (38, [321](#), 410 etc.) [107](#), (256, 1643–45) [99–100](#)
Antiope (fr. 227) [131–32](#), [201](#)
Erechtheus (fr. 350) [110](#), (fr. 370) [171](#), [207–8](#)
Melanippe Captive (fr. 494) [96–97](#), [108](#)
Temenidae, Temenus (hyp.) [315n56](#)

Harpocraton s.v.

(*arkteusai*) 332n50

(*Maimaktêriôn*) 247

(*Tritopateres*) 177

Hecataeus FGrH 1

(fr. 127) 332n48

Hellanicus FGrH 323a

(fr. 17) 139

Heracleides (*Ath.* 2) 112

Hermesianax (fr. 9) 327

Herodotus

1 (47.2) 363, (147.3) 237

2 (64.1) 285, (77.3) 302

4 (154–55) 316, (161.3) 292nII, 366, (187.3) 302

5 (46.2) 213, (70.2–72.1) 111–12, 146, 148–49, (92b 2) 363

6 (137–139.1) 332

7 (40.1) 363, (153.2–54.I) 91–92, 293, (189) 181

8 (144.2) 3

Hesiod

Op.

(109–201) 95

(724–59) 242n72

Theog.

(139–46, 501–6) 250–51

(147–53 etc.) 178

(270–336) 126

(389–401) 127n83

(535–60) 82

(693–95) 234

(817–19) 183

(901–23) 126

[Hesiod]

(fr. 337) 204

(fr. 359) 238n58

Hesychius s.v.

(*alêsion*) 236

(*arkos*) 339

(*Braurôniois*) 342

(*Dêmiasî*) 211–12

(*Diasia*) 144

(*draxôn*) 61

(*epidôtas*) 150

(*euthydêmon*) 131–32, 200–201

(*hikesios*) 355n5

(*Kotytô*) 60, 62

(*myskos*) 131–32

(*neai*) 333

(*Tripatreis*) 179n48

Himerius Or. (9.4) 234

Hippolytus Ref. omn. haer. (5.8.40) 293

Hippostratus FGrH 568

(fr. 6) [60](#)

Homer

Il.

1 (167) [44](#), (401–6) [183](#)

2 ([305–6](#)) [225](#), (353) [238](#), (653–70) [92](#), [101](#), [282–83](#), [313–14](#)

5 (499–502) [204](#)

6 (152) [314](#)

20 ([221–29](#)) [183](#), (440) [248](#)

21 ([136–99](#)) [238](#)

23 ([343–44](#)) [225](#)

Od.

1 ([68–73](#)) [126](#), [251](#), ([136–43](#)) [218](#), (259) [314](#)

2 (328) [314](#)

4 ([71–75](#)) [244](#), (506–7) [233](#)

5 ([131–32](#)) [233](#)

6 (208) [44](#)

7 (104) [204](#)

12 ([343–44](#)) [225](#)

14 (58) [44](#)

[Homer]

Hymns

Ath. ([4–7](#)) [244](#)

Dem. (47,[51–52](#), 211 etc.) [119](#), ([364–66](#)) [103](#)

Vita

(19) [244](#)

(52) [197](#)

Horace *Carm.* (1.34) [233](#)

Iamblichus *Vit. Pyth.*

(153) [223n34](#)

Ister *FGrH* 34 (fr. 51) [195n38](#)

Josephus *Ant. Jud.*

(17.7.I) [232](#)

Justin

(13.6.20) [373n9](#)

(20.2.4) [151–52](#)

Lucian *Timon* (7) [144n1](#)

Lycophron *Alex.* (984–92) [151–52](#)

Lysias (frs. [49–50](#)) [347](#)

Lysimachides *FGrH* [366](#)

(fr. 2) [247](#)

(fr. 3) [211](#)

Menander

Andria (fr. 38) [338](#)

Phasma ([57–107](#)) [343–44](#)

Rhapiomenê (fr. 330) [343](#)

Nonnus *Dion.* (6.[208–10](#)) [234](#)

Nymphodorus *FGrH* 572 (fr. 74) [98–99](#)

Orphica Bernabé

Rhapsodies

(frs. 149, 179) 126

(fr. 206) 123

(fr. 276) 123

(fr. 284) 101–2, 115n36

(frs. 292–93) 102

(fr. 88) 123

(fr. 400) 124

(fr. 802) 177

Orphic Hymns

(3) 118n46

(29) 102

(70) 101–2

(73) 232

Ovid Met. (15.28–48) 134

Paeon of Amathus *FGrH* 757 (fr. 2) 328

Pausanias

1 (9.7) 327n24,

(18.7) 137,

(19.3–6) 135–36,

(28.1) 106, 145–46,

(28.7) 107,

(30.4) 106,

(31.4) 106, 109,

(43.2) 203,

(44.3) 203

2 (2.1) 250, (9.6)

151, (10.1) 165,

194n34, (11.4)

95–96, 102, 106,

(20.1–2) 151,

(22.3) 117–18

3 (17.7, 9, 18.1) 150,

(22.1) 236,

(34.9) 314

4 (26.2) 372

5(13.8–11) 163

6 (20.1–5) 75–77,

(25.4) 75

7 (18.1) 326n22,

(19.1–20.2, 22.11) 325–27, 328n31, (25.7) 98

8 (2.3) 45, (4.3) 241,

(29.1) 250,

(34.1–4) 97–98,

100, 134n23,

(35.8) 339n67,

(36.6) 182, (53.6, 9–10) 241

9 (3.5) 243n74, (34.10, 36.1) 314

10 (11.5) 282

Pausanias *Atticista* (s.v. *embaros eimi*) 341, 343–44

Phanodemus *FGrH* 325

- (fr. 4) [207](#)
- (fr. 6) [175](#)
- (fr. 14) [339–40](#)
- Pherecrates
 - Graes* (fr. 40) [135](#)
 - Koriannô* (fr. 83) [304](#)
- Pherecydes *FGrH* [3](#)
 - (fr. 47) [35](#)
 - (fr. 175) [231–32](#)
- Philo of Byblus *FGrH* 790 (fr. 2) [192](#)
- Philochorus *FGrH* [328](#)
 - (fr. 97) [82–83](#), [137](#)
 - (frs. [100–101](#)) [332](#)
 - (fr. 182) [175–76](#)
- Philostratus (*V. Apoll.* 5.43) [66](#)
- Photius s.v.
 - (*akratiasasthai*) [217](#)
 - (*euthydêmon*) [131–32](#), [200–201](#)
- Phrynichus *Praep. soph.* (p. 39) [217](#)
- Pindar
 - Ol.*
 - 4 (1) [233](#)
 - 5 (18) [75](#)
 - 7 ([27–30](#)) [313n52](#)
 - (fr. 144) [233](#)
 - Paean* (7) [308](#)
- Plato
 - Ep.* 8 (354b) [359n17](#)
 - Leg.*
 - 6 (774e–75a) [350n109](#)
 - 9 (866a) [368](#)
 - 11 (916c) [360n27](#), (933a–b) [359](#)
 - Phaedr.* (229c) [135–36](#)
 - Resp.* (4, 439e) [207n29](#)
 - Symp.* (203b) [197](#)
 - Tim.* (40e) [126](#)
- Pliny *Hist. nat.*
 - 2 (87) [341](#)
 - 18 (64) [255](#)
 - 37 (154) [239](#)
- Plutarch
 - Alc.* (15.3–4) [151](#)
 - Cam.* (5.9) [219n19](#)
 - Dion* (49.5–7) [239](#)
 - Nic.* (28.2) [203](#)
 - Sol.* (12.1–4) [112](#), [145](#)
 - Them.* (22.2) [207n29](#)
 - Thes.* (14.1) [48–49](#), (27) [139–40](#)
 - Tit.* (16.5) [316n59](#)
 - De cohib. ira* (9, 458c) [247](#)
 - De def. or.* (15, 418a–c) [243–44](#), (41, 433b–c) [163](#)
 - De frat. amor.* (18, 489b) [246](#)
 - Non posse suav. vivi* (16, 1098b) [83](#), (22, 1102e) [150](#)

- Quaest. conv.* (9.6, 741b) [246](#)
Quaest. Gr. (9, 292d-e) [104](#), (12, 293b-c) [243–44](#), (39, 300a-c) [235n29](#)
 Polemon (fr. 49) [114–16](#)
 Pollux (8.11) [366](#)
 Proclus *Chrest.* (172) [368](#)
- Scholia
- Ar.
- Eccl.* (18) [210n45](#)
 Lys. (645) [345–46](#)
 Callim. *H. Zeus* (3) [234n25](#)
 Hom. *Il.* (8.39) [180](#)
 Luc. *Catapl.* (25) [332n49](#)
 Paus. (1.1.4) [210n45](#)
 Pind.
- Ol.* (3.33a) [66](#),
 (5.40) [75](#),
 (11.58) [163](#),
 (13.56b) [58](#)
Pyth. (hyp. 3) [243](#)
 Soph. *Oed. Col.* (42) [134n23](#)
 Theocr. *Id.* (2.66) [331n43](#),
 (6.40b) [58](#)
 Servius *Ecl.* (8.82) [46](#)
 Siculus Flaccus *Grom. Lat.* (1.105) [118](#)
 Simonides (IEG² fr. 3) [181](#)
Sophocles
- Ant.* (974) [232](#)
 Oed. Col. (41–43, 100, 129 etc.) [106](#), (82, [131–33](#), [156–57](#) etc.) [115n37](#), (466–507) [108](#), (483–84) [115](#), (1600) [109](#)
Phil. (1289) [244](#)
Kôphoi (fr. 366) [35](#)
Phineus (frs. 704–5) [182](#)
Syndeipnoi (fr. 563 Pearson) [43n4](#)
Tympanistai (fr. 645) [182](#)
 Sophron *Tai gynaiques* (frs. 3–9) [360](#)
 Statius *Theb.*
 (4.50–58) [96](#)
 (12.481–509) [37–38](#)
 Stephanus s.v.
 (*Deipnias*) [243–44](#)
 (*Tragia*) [282](#)
 Stesichorus (*PMG* frs. [210–12](#), [217](#), 219) [99–100](#)
- Strabo
- 1 (3.18) [341](#)
 6(1.6) [316n59](#), (1.14) [151–52](#)
 7 (frs. [38–40](#)) [234n25](#)
 10 (3.16) [57](#)
 Suda (s.v. *tritogeneia*) [180](#)
 Syncellus *Chron.*
 (368) [66n65](#)
- Telestes (*PMG* fr. 810) [64](#), [82](#)

Terence *Andria* (473) [338](#)

Theocritus

Id.

5 (24) [284](#)

7 ([31–34](#), [155–57](#)) [49](#)

18 ([22–24](#)) [349n107](#), (48) [50](#)

26 (1) [204](#)

Epigr. (1.5) [204](#)

Theophrastus

Char. (16) [286n26](#), [360](#)

De caus. pl. (3.21.2), [255](#)

De piet.

(fr. 2) [45](#)

(fr. 18) [227–28](#)

Theopompus *FGrH* 115 (fr. ,344) [11](#)

Thucydides

1 (126.[2–12](#)) [111–12](#),

[137](#),[145–48](#), ,(128.[1–2](#)) [147](#),[149–50](#), (134.4) [150](#), (135.1) [147](#)

2 (15.[3–6](#)) [138](#),

(48.1) [302](#)

5 (53) [311–12](#),

(55.[4–56.1](#), 75.[5–6](#), 77.2, 80.3) [315n57](#),

(82.2) [151](#)

6 (8.2, 20.[3–4](#),[47–48](#), 62.1) [254](#)

7 (57.8) [254n6](#)

Timaeus *FGrH* 566

(frs. [51–52](#)) [151n30](#)

(fr. 148) [61–62](#)

Traditions of the Eupatridae *FGrH* 356 (fr. 1) [367–68](#)

Valerius Maximus (5.3 ext. ,3f) [107](#)

Virgil *Aen.*

6 (250) [102](#), (280) [102n70](#)

7 (327) [102](#)

12 (486) [102](#)

Xenon *FGrH* [273](#)

(fr. 30) [316](#)

Xenophon

Anab.

1 (8.18) [140](#)

7 (8.1–6) [137n40](#), [193–94](#)

Hell.

2(4.20) [11](#)

4 (4.[2–4](#)) [11](#)

7 (4.14) [75](#), (4.[28–29](#)) [77](#)

Oec. (5.10) [82](#)

Zenobius (3.112) [61](#)

Inscriptions

Where I have cited two or more presentations of a given document, only one is entered here.

Agora

xvi (no. 218) [114n30](#)

xix (H 20) 171

BCH 89 (441–52 nos. 1–12

Thasos) 236–37

*GHI*²

(5 Cyrene) 283–84

(30 Teos) 142*n*3

(38 Selinus) 103*n*77, 165*n*41

(96 Cyrene) 371–72

Hesperia

15 (199–201 no. 40) 114*n*33

24 (228–32) 114*n*33

76 (47–49) 170–71, 208–9

ICr 2

(9 Oaxus) 196

(19 Phalasarna) 361

IDélos I (66–67) 171

IG I³ Athens

(6) 65, 137

(104) 216

(234) 135, 138

(246) 169–70, 173

(250) 121

(369) 135

(383) 135

(386) 135*n*28

(972) 177*n*38

(1065) 206

(1066a–c) 169

(1067) 169

IG 2² Athens

(949) 121

(1035) 207

(1365–66) 335*n*55

(1496) 121

(1514, 1516, 1518, 1522) 346

(2615) 171

(4569) 211

(4678) 211

(4964–65) 247

IG 4.1² Epidaurus

(121) 355*n*6

IG 5.1 Laconia

(700) 355*n*7

(1316) 236, 239, 248

IG 5.2 Arcadia

(36–37, 39, 40) 241, 248

(288) 249*n*99

IG 7 Boeotia

(1783) [98](#)
(4135–36) [65](#)
IG 12.2 Lesbos
(70) [247](#)
(484) [237](#)
IG 12.3 Thera (350, [354–55](#)) [94](#)
IG 12.5
(47 Naxos) [247](#)
(53 Naxos) [237n51](#)
(310 Paros) [103](#)
(1027 Paros) [236](#), [238](#)
IG 12.7 (91 Amorgos) [150](#)
IG 12 Suppl.
(208 Paros) [237](#)
(353 Thasos) [161](#)
IG 14 Italy (1293) [314n55](#)
IvKnidos (154) [361](#)
IvKyme (37) [239](#)
IvOlympia (22) [254](#)

Lindos [2](#)
(1) [254n4](#), [283](#)
(580–619) [308–11](#)

*LSAG*²
(p. 261 no. 22 Croton) [151](#)
(p. 277 no. 42 Selinus) [202](#)
LSAM (12 Pergamum)
[285n22](#)

LSCG
(96 Myconos) [121](#), [161](#), [282n10](#)
(124 Eresus) [285n21](#)
(151 Cos) [303n11](#)
(154 Cos) [223nn34](#), [36](#),
[303n11](#)

LSS
(63 Thasos) [161](#)
(104 Cos) [282n10](#)

Marm. Par. FGrH [239](#)
(B [10–11](#)) [373n9](#)

Orph. Bernabe
(fr. 475 Entella) [91](#),
[95n42](#)
(fr. 476 Petelia) [95n42](#)
(fr. 830e Locri) [361](#)
(fr. 830f Himera) [361](#)

SEG
Athens
21 (527) [173](#)
26 (98) [114n33](#)
38 (265) [107](#)

52 (48) [109–10](#), [237n53](#), 248

Attica

21 (541 Erchia) [135](#), [137](#), [160](#), [171](#), [173–74](#), [303n10](#)

33 (147 Thoricus) [137](#), [239](#), 246

50 (168 Marathon Tetrapolis) [49n27](#), [120](#), [159–60](#), [171–74](#), [235](#), 289

52 (104 Brauron) [322](#)

Atrax

35 (315) [331–32](#)

Chios

17 (406) [238](#)

38 (833) [98–99](#)

Corinth

26 (393) [32](#)

32 (359) [32](#)

Cyrene

9 (1) 303, [373](#), (11–44) 321, 335, (107–8, 110) [94](#), (325–46) [93–94](#), (345) [308](#)

20 (723a–d) [93–94](#), (757, 760) [94](#)

Eleutherna 41 (744) [311n37](#)

Entella

30 (1117–18, 1120) [90–91](#)

40 (786) [90](#)

Epidaurus 26 (449) [355n6](#)

Erbessus? 35 (1009) [50](#)

Gela? 45 (1359) [132–33](#)

Larissa 44 (453) [331](#)

Lindus 38 (786) [282](#), 39 (729) [355n6](#), [365–68](#)

Megalopolis 28 (421) [285n21](#)

Mycenae 40 (334) [355n6](#)

Mylasa 51 (1525) [228n51](#)

Nacone 30 (1119) [283III3](#)

Oaxus

23 (566) [316](#)

37 (743) [38n39](#), 316

Phalanna 44 (457) [332](#)

Selinus

19(615) [165n41](#)

38 (40!) [133](#)

40 (806) [89–90](#)

Thasos 17 (415) [144n3](#)

SIG³

(985 Philadelphia) [87](#)

(991 Galepsus) [237](#)

Suppl. Epigr. Cir.

(80) [293n14](#)

(114) [294](#)

(158) [281–82](#), 290

([226–27](#), 232) [94](#)

Tit. Camirenses

(127) [96n49](#)